

land, general secretary, praying for the enforcement of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Springfield, Ill., entering solemn protest against repeal of war-time prohibition, and reciting that the President has seen fit to recommend to Congress an appeal to lift the ban on beer and wines, thereby betraying the organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Greenville College, of Greenville, Ill., signed by E. G. Burrett and 300 students, praying for enforcement of prohibition, and also a definition of intoxicating liquors in accordance with the findings of science; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Laurel Methodist Episcopal Church, of Springfield, Ill., praying for Congress to defeat any revocation of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Freeport, Ill., deeply deploring the recommendation of the President, protesting against repeal of the war-time prohibition law, and urging adequate enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Charles F. McKown, of Athens, Ill., chairman Red Cross and pastor Methodist Episcopal Church and mayor of the city, and brother citizens, protesting against the repeal of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Leo Howard, of Whitehall, Ill.; H. C. Reichel, of Kewanee, Ill.; G. R. McCasland, of Granite, Ill.; and Mount Auburn Methodist Episcopal Church, by C. L. Lotz, pastor, all protesting against the repeal of the war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, June 24, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, June 23, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

STEAMBOAT-INSPECTION SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 42).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$550,000 required by the Steamboat-Inspection Service for "Contingent expenses, Steamboat-Inspection Service, fiscal year 1919," which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4226) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and has appointed Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota, Mr. CRAMTON, and Mr. BUCHANAN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War; and

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons, whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted at a conference of Union Churches at Greenwood, Mass., favoring the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the National Garment Retailers' Association, praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of comrades of James Bryant Post, No. 119, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the Bolshevik propaganda openly carried on in that city, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERNALD presented a memorial of the Aroostook and Penobscot Union, Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Littleton, Me., and a memorial of the Aroostook Federation of Farmers, of Caribou, Me., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. COLT presented a memorial of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Woonsocket, R. I., remonstrating against the repeal of war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry naval-torpedo employees at Newport, R. I., praying for the establishment of a 44-hour week as the standard of employment at all navy yards, depots, stations, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of the Aroostook Federation of Farmers of Caribou, Me., and a memorial of the Aroostook and Penobscot Union, Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Littleton, Me., remonstrating against the proposed plan of the Secretary of the Interior for the reclamation of lands for discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the sale of uncompleted ships to any foreign nation and favoring legislation for the completion of such ships, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Olympic Club of San Francisco, Calif., remonstrating against war-time prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Calif., praying that Congress take such steps as are necessary to encourage the return to the agricultural districts of the labor that was taken to the industrial centers during the progress of the war, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. ROBINSON, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 253) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 34) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 248) for the relief of Henry P. Grant, of Phillips County, Ark. (Rept. No. 35);

A bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown (Rept. No. 36);

A bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas (Rept. No. 37);

A bill (S. 1289) for the relief of Simon M. Preston (Rept. No. 38); and

A bill (S. 1479) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane (Rept. No. 39).

WALSTON H. BROWN.

Mr. MOSES. On May 20 I introduced a bill, being the bill (S. 495) for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., and it was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I ask that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, that action will be taken.

PEND OREILLE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 2954) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Pend Oreille River, between the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, in the State of Washington, and I submit a report (No. 33) thereon. As it is a short bill and reported favorably from the committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Pend Oreille County, State of Washington, and the towns of Metaline and Metaline Falls, Pend Oreille County, Wash., their successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized, jointly or separately, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Pend Oreille River, at a point suitable

to the interests of navigation between said towns, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON RULES.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 70, submitted by Mr. KNOX on the 5th instant, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE AND RETRENCHMENT.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 89, submitted by Mr. STERLING on the 21st instant, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 2225) granting an increase of pension to H. McFarlin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2226) granting a pension to Otis B. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COLT:

A bill (S. 2227) granting a pension to Carrie M. Birdsall; and

A bill (S. 2228) granting a pension to John E. King; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2229) for the relief of Henry von Hess; and

A bill (S. 2230) for the relief of Elijah L. Gum; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON:

A bill (S. 2231) granting to certain claimants the preference right to purchase unappropriated public lands in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also, authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such local and district boards; also, authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials in the name of Congress an appropriate medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire and complete immediately the hospital at Broadview, Cook County, Ill., authorized and appropriated for by the act approved March 3, 1919, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PHELAN submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$250,000 for an immigration station at San Francisco, Calif., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CONDITIONS OF WAGE EARNERS.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I submit an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Labor to continue inquiry into methods of betterment of working conditions of wage earners, to collect and disseminate information and advice for the elimination of causes of strikes and industrial unrest. For the above purposes for salaries of officers

and employees in the District of Columbia and in the field; per diem in lieu of subsistence at not exceeding \$4; traveling expenses; fuel, light, and heat; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; supplies and equipment; typewriters; telephone and telegraph service; contingent expenses and all other miscellaneous items and necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, \$45,000.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice of a motion to suspend Rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate in order to offer an amendment to the naval appropriation bill.

At the end of the bill add a new section, as follows:

That sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Chapter XV of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Interdepartmental social hygiene board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the interdepartmental social hygiene board, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To make rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under sections 5 and 6; (3) to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purpose of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) to direct the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 provided in section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business."

Sec. 2. That the interdepartmental social hygiene board is hereby authorized and directed to adopt measures for the purpose of assisting the various States in caring for civilian persons whose detention, isolation, quarantine, or commitment to institutions may be found necessary for the protection of the military and naval forces and the civilian population of the United States against venereal diseases.

Sec. 5. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this chapter: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein made shall not be deemed exclusive, but may be supplemented by other appropriations of a more general character which are applicable to the same or similar purposes.

Sec. 6. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,400,000 annually for two fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1918, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of \$1,000,000, which shall be paid to the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the interdepartmental social hygiene board; this sum to be allotted to each State in the proportion which its population bears to the population of the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska and the Canal Zone, according to the last preceding United States census, and such allotment to be so conditioned that for each dollar paid to any State the State shall specifically appropriate or otherwise set aside an equal amount for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases, except for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, for which the allotment of money is not conditioned upon the appropriation or setting aside of money by the State: *Provided*, That any State may obtain any part of its allotment for any fiscal year subsequent to June 30, 1919, by specifically appropriating or otherwise setting aside an amount equal to such part of its allotment for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases: *And provided*, That where a State has no legislative session between the date of this law and the 1st day of January, 1920, the interdepartmental social hygiene board may, in its discretion, allot to said State for the period from July 1, 1919, to December 31, 1919, the monthly proportion of the sum allotted to it in accordance with the provisions of this section of this chapter. In case any State receiving such allotment fails to appropriate or otherwise set aside on or before February 14, 1920, an amount equal to its allotment or such part of its allotment as it may have received between July 1, 1919, and December 31, 1919, then it shall be within the discretion of the interdepartmental social hygiene board to discontinue all other allotments to such State from each and every fund under this chapter until such appropriation may be made by the legislature then in session in such State: *And provided*, That an allotment refused by any State or States shall be available for the purposes of any of the appropriations made in this chapter; the sum of \$100,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions as in the judgment of the interdepartmental social hygiene board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the interdepartmental social hygiene board, more effective medical measures in the prevention and treatment of venereal diseases; the sum of \$300,000, which shall be paid to such universities, colleges, or other suitable institutions or organizations as in the judgment of the interdepartmental social hygiene board are qualified for scientific research, for the purpose of discovering and developing more effective educational measures in the prevention of venereal diseases, and for the purpose of sociological and physiological research related thereto.

Sec. 7. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, to be apportioned as follows: The sum of \$200,000 to defray the expenses of the establishment and maintenance of the division of venereal diseases in the Bureau of the Public Health Service, and the sum of \$100,000 to be used under the direction of the interdepartmental social hygiene board for miscellaneous expenses of that board, including personal services and rent of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, actual or per diem, in lieu of subsistence; printing and binding, periodicals, law books, and books of reference.

Any unexpended balances appropriated under this chapter are hereby reapportioned and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, for any purpose for which any of the appropriations made by this chapter are available.

Sec. 8. That the terms "State" and "States," as used in this chapter, shall be held to include the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS.

Mr. FERNALD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 93), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan tents for use at encampments held by veterans of the World War was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution providing for the appointment by each Member of the House of Representatives of two persons whose names shall be placed on the rolls of employees of the House of Representatives was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED SALE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and let it lie on the table, and to-morrow morning, at the close of the morning business, or as soon thereafter as I can be heard, I shall call it up and submit some remarks upon it. I should like to have it read and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That in the judgment of the Senate it is not advisable for the United States Shipping Board to sell at this time any of the merchant ships of the Government to foreign interests unless it be such as can not be successfully employed here.

Resolved further, That efficient merchant ships of the Government should not be sold at all at this time, except such ships as are undesirable for overseas trade and will bring approaching their actual cost or more, and then only with a view of replacing them with better ships and in order to properly balance the fleet.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Ordnance stores and supplies," on page 65, line 12, after the word "Artillery," to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000," so as to make the clause read:

For overhauling, cleaning, repairing, and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops and at the arsenals, posts, and depots; for purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops; for Infantry, Cavalry, and Artillery equipments, including horse equipments for Cavalry and Artillery, \$2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the chairman if it is proposed out of this appropriation to purchase and manufacture ordnance stores?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Chief of Ordnance in his statement before the committee reminded us that this money is needed to take care of the ordnance supplies turned in by the returning troops that are being mustered out of the service on their return from France or being mustered out after service in the United States, such as rifles, bayonets, mess kits, and other kinds of equipment that have to be cleaned up and oiled and packed away. We thought they could do it for \$2,000,000. They asked, I will say to the Senator, for this item \$4,446,000. The House cut it to \$3,000,000, and we cut it to \$2,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator have any objection to striking out the words "purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops"? I think that authority ought to be withdrawn.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection, because I believe for this next year they will not be purchasing or manufacturing any more.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is true, and with that in view I move, in lines 9 and 10, to strike out the words "for purchase and manufacture of ordnance stores to fill requisitions of troops."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, I agree to it with the understanding that if it proves later to actually stifle some necessary purpose that I do not happen to know about now we can take it up in conference.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National trophy and medals for rifle contests," on page 65, line 18, after the word "Guard," to strike out "or Organized Militia" and insert "Organized Militia or State Guard," so as to make the clause read:

For the purpose of furnishing a national trophy and medal and other prizes to be provided and contested for annually, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, said contest to be open to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the National Guard, Organized Militia or State Guard of the several States, Territories, and of the District of Columbia, members of rifle clubs, and civilians, and for the cost of the trophy, prizes, and medals herein provided for, and for the promotion of rifle practice throughout the United States, including the reimbursement of necessary expenses of members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, to be expended for the purpose hereinbefore prescribed under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 12, to insert:

TANK CORPS SCHOOL.

Incidental expenses in connection with the operation of Tank Corps schools, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "National Guard," subhead "Arming, equipping, and training the National Guard," on page 66, line 18, after the words "Purchase of," to strike out "horses" and insert "animals," so as to make the clause read:

Purchase of animals for mounted units, \$1,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the chairman of the committee refer to the page in the hearings where this appropriation is asked for?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Page 332 of Gen. Carter's testimony as printed in the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House appropriated \$1,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It did.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the purpose of forming Cavalry regiments?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The national defense act in its National Guard provision provides that the War Department shall issue to mounted units of the National Guard, Cavalry and Field Artillery and mounted Signal Corps troops, a certain number of horses per unit. The War Department asked \$1,186,000 for this purpose. The House cut it to \$1,000,000, and we leave it at \$1,000,000. That is the provision of law.

Mr. McKELLAR. How many Cavalry troops have we now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not say how many we have now, as the National Guard is in process of reconstruction. Prior to the war we had very considerable mounted units such as Field Artillery and Cavalry and field signal battalions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 19, after the word "for," to strike out "horses" and insert "animals," so as to make the clause read:

Procurement of forage, bedding, etc., for animals, \$1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, line 22, after the word "equipment," to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,250,000," so as to make the clause read:

Compensation of help for care of matériel, animals, and equipment, \$1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 4, after the words "United States," to strike out "\$35,000" and insert "\$43,750," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of property and disbursing officers for the United States, \$43,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 8, after the word "inspections," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$40,000," so as to make the clause read:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers making inspections, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 10, after the word "stations," to strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$5,000," so as to make the clause read:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers changing stations, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 12, after the word "instruction," to strike out "\$40,000" and insert "\$30,000," so as to make the clause read:

Travel of Federal officers and noncommissioned officers on visits of instruction, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 18, after the word "supplies," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

Transportation of supplies, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 21, after the words "armory drills" in parentheses, to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert: "\$4,000,000: *Provided*, That all the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the equipping and arming of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund," so as to make the clause read:

Pay of National Guard (armory drills), \$4,000,000: *Provided*, That all the moneys hereinbefore appropriated for the equipping and arming of the National Guard shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 23, after the word "equipping," I move to strike out the word "and" and after the word "arming" to insert the words "and training," so as to read:

For the equipping, arming, and training of the National Guard.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 1, to strike out "surplus" before "stores"; in line 4, after the word "act," to strike out "of" and insert: "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved"; in line 6, after "1916," to strike out "which law is still in force and applicable to State forces"; in line 7, after the word "issue," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 8, after the word "and," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 10, after the word "State," to strike out: "troops. Issue will be made as soon as the provisions of act of June 3, 1916, shall have been fulfilled," and insert "troops"; in line 12, after the word "section," to strike out "62" and insert "62 of the"; in line 13, after the word "act," to strike out "of" and insert: "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved"; in line 15, before the word "be," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 17, after the words "attained by," to strike out "December 31, 1919," and insert "June 30, 1920"; in line 20, after the word "this," to strike out "will" and insert "shall"; in line 21, before the word "section," to insert "said"; in the same line, after the number "62," to strike out "as now worded"; in line 23, after the word "Guard," to insert "shall"; and in line 24, after the words "upon the," to strike out "date this becomes a law" and insert "approval of this act," so as to make the clause read:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to issue from stores now on hand and purchased for the United States Army such articles of clothing and equipment: matériel as may be needed by the National Guard organized under the provisions of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916. This issue shall be made without charge against militia appropriations and shall be reimbursed in kind for all Federal property brought into service by State troops: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 62 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, shall be considered fulfilled if the first strength mentioned therein be attained by June 30, 1920, and the other increments provided therein be attained by successive years thereafter: *Provided further*, That this shall not prevent any State from compliance with the provisions of said section 62: *Provided further*, That the appropriations and provisions of this act referring to the National Guard shall become applicable and available upon the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 1, after the word "act," to strike out "of" and insert: "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved," so as to make the clause read:

That section 69 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 1, after the word "contract," to insert: "and the previous enlistment shall in such cases and with the consent of the enlisted man be canceled," so as to make the clause read:

Sec. 69. Enlistments in the National Guard: Hereafter the period of enlistment in the National Guard shall be the same as is or may be prescribed for the Regular Army: *Provided*, That all persons who have served as enlisted men in the Army of the United States or the Organized Militia of the several States subsequent to April 6, 1917, and who have been honorably discharged from such service, may within six months after such discharge or within six months after the passage of this act enlist in the National Guard for a period of one year, and may reenlist for like periods, and that such enlistments shall not be counted in computing the proportion authorized to be enlisted for one year to conform to the period of enlistment prescribed for the Regular Army: *Provided further*, That enlisted men in the National Guard of the several States now serving under contracts

providing for a six-year period of enlistment—three years in an active organization and the remaining three years in the National Guard Reserve—shall be afforded an opportunity to enlist for the periods specified above, and upon entering into a new contract of enlistment for a period of three years under this authority shall be given credit for the period served under the old enlistment contract and the previous enlistment shall in such cases and with the consent of the enlisted man be canceled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, after line 3, to insert:

That to comply with the provisions of section 110 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, it is hereby provided that staff officers, including officers of the Pay, Inspection, Subsistence, and Medical Departments, appointed in the National Guard of the District of Columbia shall have had previous military experience and shall hold their positions until they shall have reached the age of 64 years, unless retired prior to that time by reason of resignation, disability, or for cause to be determined by a court-martial legally convened for that purpose, and that vacancies among said officers shall be filled by appointment from the officers of the National Guard of the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator explain this amendment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The national-defense act provides that in the issuance of commissions to staff officers of the National Guard there shall be a condition precedent—that is, that each State legislature shall enact a law providing that men who are to be commissioned as staff officers of the National Guard shall have had previous military service; furthermore, that they shall hold their positions in the National Guard until they shall reach the age of 64 years, the purpose being to eliminate politics in the several States from the staff serving with the National Guard. All the States of the Union have enacted those laws. The District of Columbia never has done so through the Congress, and the War Department—the Judge Advocate General, I believe, of the War Department—has ruled that it takes an act of Congress such as this in order to put the staff officers of the District of Columbia National Guard on the same footing as staff officers of the National Guard of all of the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Were there any hearings on this item?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There were not on this particular item. A memorandum was filed by Gen. Carter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was there not a separate bill introduced and would it not be better to have the matter take that form? It affects the peculiar military organization that exists here in the District of Columbia, which is about half National Guard and half not, as I recall the law. I think before we fix the National Guard here the matter ought to have very careful consideration from the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It did have the careful consideration of the committee. We discussed this matter at some length, and the memorandum of the War Department was gone into. It was filed before us. The National Guard of the District of Columbia is now being reconstituted under the terms of the national-defense act. They have something like six or seven hundred men enlisted now. They intend to go on recruiting in the usual way until they reach their old figure of something like 2,000 or 2,500 men, all in accordance with law. But we can not have any staff officers until Congress prescribes that the staff officers shall have had previous military experience and shall not be disturbed in their tenure of office except by court-martial or by resignation.

Mr. McKELLAR. In what way does this change the law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It makes the law in respect to National Guard staff officers in the District of Columbia uniform with all the other States.

Mr. McKELLAR. There were a number of these staff officers appointed under a modified act that we passed, I believe, since the war was on. I think it was passed about a year ago. There was a reorganization, and the National Guard of the District of Columbia was not permitted to go outside the District except into Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This does not apply to that National Guard at all. It applies to the National Guard organized under the national-defense act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Rifle ranges for civilian instruction," on page 70, line 22, after the word "law," to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$200,000," so as to make the clause read:

For arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice for issue in connection with the encouragement of rifle practice in pursuance of the provisions of law, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Civilian military training camps," on page 71, line 5, after the word "act," to insert "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual

provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," so as to make the clause read:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, horse equipment; ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice; and for overhauling and repairing arms for issue and use in connection with training camps for civilians in pursuance of the provisions of section 54 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, §100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Reserve Corps," subhead "Ordnance stores, equipment, etc., Reserve Officers' Training Corps," on page 71, line 14, after the word "act," to insert "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,'" so as to make the clause read:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for use in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, established by the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, §100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance supplies for military equipment of schools and colleges," on page 71, line 23, after the word "act," to insert "entitled 'An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,'" and on page 72, line 2, after the date "1916," to strike out "\$100: Provided" and insert "\$100," so as to make the clause read:

For arms and ordnance equipment, including overhauling and repairing of personal equipments, machine-gun outfits, and horse equipments for issue to schools and colleges in pursuance of the provisions of section 56 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, §100.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 6, after the words "of the," to strike out "appropriations: And provided further" and insert "appropriations," so as to make the clause read:

That the appropriations herein made for the support of the Army and the National Guard are available for such printing, binding, and blank books as may be necessary in putting in effect the objects of the appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 14, after the word "proper," to strike out "appropriations: And provided further" and insert "appropriations," so as to make the clause read:

That hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 16, after the word "That," to insert "except as hereinbefore provided or in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made or definite obligations already incurred, or where it is necessary, in order to protect the interest of the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919, on the land to be purchased," so as to make the clause read:

That except as hereinbefore provided or in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made or definite obligations already incurred, or where it is necessary, in order to protect the interest of the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919, on the land to be purchased, no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, before this amendment is agreed to, and I shall support the amendment, I think the Senate ought to know why a provision of this character is deemed necessary at all. Yesterday in the discussion of another subject I stated that Congress ought not to vest in the War Department the fullest discretion in the expenditure of money, and there had been at least one gross violation of a breach of trust morally upon the part of the War Department, to which I would refer before the consideration of the bill was completed, and I think the Senate at this time ought to know the facts in the case to which I then had reference.

Mr. President, there was established at Camp Benning, in Georgia, an Infantry School of Arms, removed from Fort Sill, in Oklahoma. This matter received a great deal of discussion in the House, and I think I can, by quoting some of the letters and testimony, get the facts before the Senate in a much briefer way than if I undertook to state them myself. I begin by reading a letter appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 1060, written to Congressman MONDELL, of the House, by one C. C. Minter, of Cusseta, Ga.:

MY DEAR MR. MONDELL: I wish to call your attention to the large expenditure of money by the War Department on a military camp down here in Chattahoochee County, Ga., known as Fort Benning.

The War Department on November 2, 1918, filed a petition for condemnation of 130,000 acres of land in Chattahoochee and Muscogee Counties, Ga., for a military reservation.

There lives within this area about 8,000 civilian population. They are taking from Chattahoochee County 72,000 acres of land out of a total of 165,000 acres in the entire county. Chattahoochee County is a small county, with 5,640 population. This camp is taking in about 3,300 of the population, most of whom are opposed to giving up their homes.

In January of this year we succeeded in getting a hearing before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in opposition to this camp. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, after hearing both sides, for and against the camp, passed a resolution disapproving the project. The War Department suspended work, and announced no further work would be done on Fort Benning and that proper steps would be taken to salvage same. Immediately after the adjournment of Congress on March 4 the War Department again began the construction of this camp, and are now very busily engaged in building same, working some 4,000 or 5,000 laborers and spending money in a most lavish and extravagant manner. It strikes me that the War Department is undertaking to build a permanent camp in an illegal and fraudulent way, spending money that was appropriated for camp sites, camps, and cantonments during the war emergency.

The department has succeeded in buying about 30,000 acres of this land at an average cost of \$42 per acre. Much of the most expensive land within the area is yet to be purchased or condemned and paid for. For this project to go forward and be completed on the large scale proposed, means an expenditure in due time of \$75,000,000 or \$100,000,000.

Let me say, in passing, that the testimony appearing before the House Military Affairs Committee is to the effect that only an expenditure of \$7,000,000 is contemplated. I have read the material portion of the letter. Before this camp of Infantry School of Small Arms was removed to Camp Benning, where the Government did not own an acre of land, where it proposed to acquire 115,000 acres, the same Infantry School of Small Arms was located at Fort Sill, Okla. I wish to read a letter from Hon. SCOTT FERRIS, of Oklahoma, a man of the highest integrity, one of the most prominent members of his party, to the Secretary of War, dated May 20, 1918:

MAY 20, 1918.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of your letter of May 15 regarding Fort Sill; also the memorandums from Brig. Gen. Brown and Brig. Gen. Snow.

I can not but feel that time will disclose that a serious mistake is being made at Fort Sill. The military reservation proper contains 56,000 acres. There is a forest reserve adjoining it, any part or all of which could be annexed by Executive order of the President merely by the stroke of a pen, without any additional law or legislation. This would give ample room not only for the School of Fire, School of Small Arms, but the cantonment as well.

To construct a cantonment at an expense of \$2,300,000 and then abandon it in the midst of a World War, and go out buying and renting land, establishing new cantonments and acquiring new areas seems wrong to me. Again, the School of Small Arms, which was established in 1915, prior to the war, with all the time and money expended thereon, is now being abandoned and held for naught. This, too, seems wrong. I wish I knew something to say or something to do to spare you this mistake.

The press reports are to the effect that all other cantonments are being used to the limit, even large additional expenditures are being made for them. Large prices are being paid for material and lands to acquire and construct new cantonments and maintain the ones already constructed. In the face of this condition of affairs, to abandon Fort Sill seems to me to be poor economy, and seems to me to be a mistake which we might now avoid. I have, however, in person appealed to you regarding the matter. I have filed written data and bills of particulars as I understand them to exist. I would, if I knew how, do anything else I could or make any kind of an appeal possible to prevent this mistake, and what to me seems surely false economy. I repeat, if I knew anything else to do or say, if I knew any other appeal I could make to you, or any of the generals who have brought this about, I would make it. With great respect, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

The Secretary of War replied to that letter, but his reply does not appear in the RECORD. However, the reply called out another letter from Mr. FERRIS, which I read, dated May 27, as follows:

MAY 27, 1918.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was good of you to write me your good letter of May 24 and to give me a chance to be heard on this matter. It is good of you to have a second investigation made about it.

That reservation down there is so large and so beautiful that to utilize it during the first year of the war and abandon it thereafter and go out and buy land, it does seem that somewhere along the line we should find some one to appreciate it and to recognize the necessity of using land that belongs to the Government and not go out and buy or rent land that is less valuable.

I had not intended to trouble you with this matter any further. I had intended to let it go, but your good, warm, and friendly letter makes me bold enough to again urge you when the second investigation is made to investigate the advisability of utilizing the 65,000-acre forestry reserve that lies immediately adjoining the Fort Sill military reserve. That entire reserve is barren of timber. It has a little herd of buffalo on it, but they consume such a small part of it that it is negligible, and the rest is only used for grazing cattle.

If the military authorities need more room, under the withdrawal act of June 25, 1910, known as the Pickett bill, the President can with the stroke of a pen withdraw this area or, rather, transfer and use any or all of it without disturbing any governmental function. This would afford a range large enough to carry on, without paying any rent, without buying an acre of land, and at the same time not sacrifice three or four million dollars of expenditure that has already been made there, but, on the contrary, could utilize it.

Again, I repeat that I had not intended to bother you further with this, but when I see a mistake being made that I am sure is a mistake, I have felt it my duty to tell you about it rather than wait until a shower bath of trouble comes down on us when it is too late. In other words, if I seem impatient or appear overzealous and almost bordering on a nuisance to you, it is in an effort to make certain that you do not abandon and fail to utilize Government property that could be economically utilized, and further to avoid mistake. With great respect, I am,
Very sincerely, yours,

That was the situation with reference to the transfer of this military site. Whatever may be said with reference to the advisability of that transfer when we were at war, Mr. President, there can not be the slightest justification for going on with it after the war has ceased, for going on with it at a time when the work had scarcely begun.

What was the situation with reference to this Camp Benning on the 11th day of November when the armistice was signed? It appears in the House hearings of last session that Secretary Baker appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and stated this:

When we went before the Senate committee, however, these Senators who were present expressed pretty confident judgment that it was wiser not to go forward with the Columbus, Ga., camp—

This is the Benning Camp—

which involves very large acreage, but the amount already purchased being exceedingly small. There had been no large construction actually carried out there, and it was more nearly at the beginning than the other two. For that reason, when Mr. Crowell and I talked about it afterwards, we came to the conclusion that it was pretty clear from the Senate committee's attitude that they did not look with favor on the purchase of the Columbus, Ga., camp, and therefore have entirely discontinued any purchases at Columbus, Ga.

That, Mr. President, was in January of this year.

What was the situation at that time with reference to the Government purchases at this camp? In January Mr. Woods testified before the House committee as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, at Camp Benning, what has been done there in the way of land?

Mr. WOODS. At Camp Benning the expenditures for land aggregate \$29,818.75, and the acceptances are \$118,975.75.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it contemplated that the land would cost if the project was carried out?

Mr. WOODS. The estimated cost at Camp Benning, as I now recall, was \$3,500,000 for an area of about 115,000 acres.

Mr. CANNON. At how much per acre?

Maj. HOLDEN. About \$30 per acre, roughly.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you estimate that it would cost the Government to get out of that area?

Mr. WOODS. Probably from \$300,000 to \$400,000.

Mr. CANNON. You have not much in the way of construction there, have you?

Mr. WOODS. There is a substantial amount of construction, but not the amount that has been done at either Bragg or Knox.

Mr. CANNON. The construction has been largely in the matter of a railroad, has it not?

Mr. WOODS. They have some barracks and buildings completed, and there are some under construction.

Maj. HOLDEN. I think that Mr. CANNON'S statement about this particular project is more or less correct, and that the building of a railroad was the big expenditure there.

Gen. Marshall in the hearings upon this bill before the House committee testified as follows:

Gen. MARSHALL. The Secretary of War approved the purchase of land at Camp Knox on July 19, 1918; at Camp Bragg on August 8, 1918; at Camp Benning November 15, 1918.

The Secretary of War did not even approve the purchase of an acre of land at Camp Benning until after the armistice was signed. Gen. Marshall goes on to state:

The dates on which work was authorized at Camp Benning are as follows: September 21, 1918, an expenditure of \$100,000 was authorized for temporary tent accommodations for 1,200 men. October 9, 1918, the Assistant Secretary of War approved the project for the construction of an Infantry School of Arms. This work was officially authorized by the office of the Chief of the Construction Division to the field on October 18, 1918. The contract with the Selden-Breck Co., of St. Louis, Mo., was signed on October 28, 1918—

Only about two weeks before the signing of the armistice—

and work immediately commenced. The project was modified and changed several times. The final change and adoption of project on which work is now in progress was made on March 12, 1919.

Mr. President, officials of the War Department did appear before the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and asked for their advice upon this proposition, and the Military Affairs Committee passed a resolution disapproving of this project. The Secretary of War testified that in response to that resolution of the committee they abandoned work upon the project and did not proceed to go further with it. But, Mr. President, after Congress adjourned on the 4th of March last something happened. I do not undertake to say what it was, but something happened, so that while at that time we were only obligated for the maximum sum of about \$300,000 we are now obligated to the expenditure of several million dollars for the establishment of a camp in Georgia, although we have all the land that is necessary in the State of Oklahoma at Fort Sill.

The Secretary of War in the hearings before the subcommittee undertook in a way to defend the action. He stated that after

the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate had passed a resolution disapproving this project, he understood the committee had reconsidered that action, and, by a tie vote, had declined to make a recommendation, and, therefore, he stated he felt free to go on with this project.

Mr. President, assuming that the committees of either of the Houses had expressed approval of a project of this kind, it did not in the least degree warrant the War Department in time of peace in using money appropriated for war purposes for a camp that had never been authorized by Congress. Never been authorized! The fact is that the House Committee on Appropriations expressly refused to make a specific appropriation for Camp Benning. The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate never did reconsider its action; it never did by a tie vote decline to express any opinion concerning it. What did happen before the committee was this: Effort was made to have the committee reconsider its action disapproving the project, and that motion failed by a tie vote. That is what happened. So that the action of the Military Affairs Committee stands to-day as disapproving this project; and, notwithstanding the fact that the War Department or the Secretary of War had no more moral right to take these millions of dollars of the Government's money and put it into this camp than I would have the right to steal so much money from my neighbor, nevertheless they have gone on and expended millions of dollars upon this site out of appropriations made by Congress for the purpose of carrying on the war. The result is we are now obligated to an expenditure of \$2,800,000 for the purchase of this land.

I wish there was some way by which the Congress could abandon this project without doing injustice to hundreds of people who have been deprived of their homes, and with whom the War Department made, it is true, a legal contract, because I admit that they had the naked legal right to do it. They had the naked legal right to do it, because Congress never dreamed that it would be necessary in making appropriations for war purposes to say to the War Department, "If the war shall terminate you shall not use this money for other purposes." That is the reason there was no restriction provided for in this legislation, because no one ever dreamed for a moment that there would be any such violation of good faith upon the part of the War Department as to use money appropriated for war purposes to buy military camps for a peace program that Congress has never adopted and that Congress has never been consulted about. As I have said, I wish there were some way in which this matter could be reached by a total abandonment of the Benning Camp. I wish there were some way, without doing great injustice to many innocent people, to prohibit the expenditure of a single dollar additional for the purchase of land at this point; but it can not be done, because they have legal contracts with the Government. We would force them to go into the Court of Claims, and they could recover in the Court of Claims.

The committee has gone in this amendment now pending as far as it can go, I think, without doing great injustice to a great many people. It will be observed that the amendment that is now pending reads as follows:

That except as hereinbefore provided or in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made or definite obligations already incurred, or where it is necessary, in order to protect the interest of the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919, on the land to be purchased, no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps.

This will stop any new obligations being incurred. This will stop a repetition of such a breach of trust upon the part of the War Department as has occurred in this instance. It can not be too strongly condemned; and I state deliberately that in normal times, in time of peace, such a violation morally upon the part of an official of the Government would come very close to leading to his impeachment.

I sincerely hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment as the committee has presented it, giving authority to the Secretary of War to use appropriations in the fulfillment of contracts heretofore made and in order to protect the Government in buildings or other valuable improvements constructed prior to January 1, 1919; but I can not permit the speech that has just been made by the Senator from Wisconsin to go unanswered. It is so far from an accurate statement of the facts that the real facts should be stated.

The assault upon the Secretary of War is, in my opinion, utterly inexcusable. I accept my part of the responsibility for his final action in this matter, and shall read the letter which I handed him with reference to what had taken place in the committee.

It was not long after the beginning of the war that Gen. Pershing found a serious lack of training on the part of our infantry. He urged upon the War Department the establishment of an infantry school of arms on a large scale. I will not stop the Senate now to read these appeals from Gen. Pershing. More complete training was required as a result of experience and observation in France by Gen. Pershing. A school of limited character was in operation at Fort Sill where wind and sand interfered with training part of the time. A shooting range was established at Perry, but here the size of the land controlled by the Government prevented extensive operations.

Boards were appointed to seek a place—boards from the Army and the staff—to determine upon a place where a school of the character Gen. Pershing desired should be established. No suggestion was made, so far as I know, by anybody in Georgia as to what place should be selected by these boards. It is true that the availability of land near Columbus for military activities had been suggested to the War Department, but this, so far as I am informed, was for a cantonment or for artillery.

The first board went over a number of places and advised that the most desirable place was at Columbus, Ga. Another board went over it and did the same thing, and the Infantry School of Arms was organized at Camp Benning, October 11, 1918.

For this peculiar kind of work, the testimony before the committee shows that a most varied topographical surface is required, and first the scheme was, before the armistice, to establish at Camp Benning, near Columbus, Ga., a training school which would occupy about 150,000 acres of land. This particular place, according to the reports of the boards that examined it, was selected on account of the great variety of topography, in part on account of the excellent climate, giving opportunity for training the year around, and because the place was accessible to cantonments and to the population of the country, all-year use being considered. If any one made a suggestion to a member of these boards that they should select a site near Columbus, Ga., I never heard it. It was purely an official act, done with the highest purpose of efficiency of training in the camp selected.

Now, what had we done? We had authorized the War Department to condemn and take immediate possession of any land needed for military purposes. Before the armistice took place the War Department, proceeding under the power given by Congress, took possession of this property and notified the owners that the fee-simple title would be taken by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMICK. Were contracts made for all this acreage prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Contracts were not made at all. The Government simply proceeded to take it, and notified them to get out, and they got out.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Government took all the acreage involved prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Practically all of it. They had all been notified to leave, and over 75 per cent of the people had left.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Is not the Senator aware that the Secretary of War did not approve the acquiring of this land at all until November 15, after the signing of the armistice?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is it not a fact that the condemnation proceedings were not instituted until November 18, and no one could receive notice to get out until condemnation proceedings are instituted?

How can I be told to leave my property until I receive a notice that the Government has instituted condemnation proceedings? Who is to tell me? I just use that as an illustration. How could notice have been sent to these people prior to November 18?

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have here the testimony of Gen. Marshall:

The Secretary of War approved the purchase of the land at Camp Knox on July 19, 1918; at Camp Bragg on August 8, 1918; at Camp Benning November 15, 1918. The acquisition of land at these camps commenced immediately after the dates of approval.

It could not have been done before the armistice.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will read first from an act of Congress giving the Secretary of War authority to take land:

That hereafter the Secretary of War may cause proceedings to be instituted in the name of the United States, in any court having jurisdiction of such proceedings for the acquirement by condemnation

of any land, temporary use thereof or other interest therein, or right pertaining thereto, needed for the site, location, construction, or prosecution of work for fortifications, coast defenses, and military training camps. * * * That when such property is acquired in time of war or the imminence thereof upon the filing of the petition for the condemnation of any land, temporary use thereof or other interest therein or right pertaining thereto to be acquired for any of the purposes aforesaid, immediate possession thereof may be taken to the extent of the interest to be acquired and the lands may be occupied and used for military purposes, and the provision of section three hundred and fifty-five of the Revised Statutes, providing that no public money shall be expended upon such land until the written opinion of the Attorney General shall be had in favor of the validity of the title, nor until the consent of the legislature of the State in which the land is located has been given, shall be, and the same are hereby, suspended during the period of the existing emergency.

I may be mistaken about the exact date but I am confident condemnation proceedings were begun before the armistice was signed. They were begun long before the facts were brought to my attention, so far as I can recall. At the time it came to my attention in January the condemnation proceedings had been instituted and the owners had been turned out of their lands and 75 per cent of them had moved off. Then it was that in my opinion the Government was bound to go on and pay for the land which it had seized with a claim of the fee simple title.

Now, it may have been a few days after the armistice was signed that condemnation proceedings were begun. The Senator from New York has the papers. It was on the 15th, was it?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The 18th, sir. The condemnation proceedings were instituted on the 18th.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then it seems that the condemnation proceedings were instituted a few days after the armistice. A copy of the condemnation proceedings was before the Senate committee and my recollection was that they were filed before the armistice was signed, but the act of Congress authorized the procedure, and the procedure caused the dispossession of 75 per cent and more of the people who lived in that territory. None of them had sought to sell their land to the Government. There had been no effort to get the Government to take it. It was a deliberate selection by officers of the Army, at nobody's instance but theirs, and the parties were turned out, very many of them, when they did not want to leave.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, the defense of the Senator seems to be defending these people who were required to leave the premises.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No.

Mr. OWEN. But the point which is involved is the conduct of the War Department after the armistice in locating this camp there and going into these enormous expenditures. That is the point.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The War Department had located the school at Benning in October. Subsequent action was a matter of discretion with the War Department. The war was not over. The armistice had been signed, but whether or not further fighting would take place nobody knew. But the part of the action of the War Department to which I desire to call attention is the subsequent action.

I insist that with the procedure for the condemnation of this land the Government took the fee simple interest under this broad act, and that the Government was in good faith and in law bound to buy the land. It occupied an entirely different status from the ordinary procedure under ordinary acts of State legislatures; and these people left their property in pursuance of the action of the department in instituting legal procedure to condemn their land and notifying them to leave. The Government had the right to take the fee; and, as I stated on the first of January, when this matter was brought to my attention, from 75 to 85 per cent of the people had moved out of their farms, had given up their property, and very many of them had gone elsewhere and bought property on credit. Now, in that situation I insisted, without a doubt of the soundness of my contention, that it was the duty of the department to go forward and pay for the land.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. By the same reasoning, would the Senator say that it was the duty of the department to go ahead with every war contract that it had made prior to the armistice and to pay the full value?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No. Such a case as the one mentioned by the Senator does not occupy the same position at all. Here were a set of farmers who by the act of the department were turned out of their property, sent away from their farms, went elsewhere, and bought other farms, relying upon the Government to pay for what it had said it intended to take and did take; good faith and law required that the Government go on with the transaction, and legally, in my opinion, the Government was bound to do so.

Now, as to what happened later on: The original project was for \$14,000,000. It was reduced to about \$6,000,000. This, I believe, did not include material unused at cantonments, which would sell for little and was to be used at Benning. The department, pending the hearing, sent a board to examine Camp Bragg to see if it could not be changed into an Infantry school of arms. The report from Camp Bragg was that it would cost practically as much to make the change at Camp Bragg necessary to establish there the school as it would to go on with Benning, and that it was not nearly so desirable as a location for a school of arms.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, would it not be better to call it a strong-arm school?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, a properly organized small-arms school is a very strong arm in the Army, and we have the opinion of Gen. Pershing to that effect; and, really, we won the war on the 18th of May by the men who had received special training in that line.

That committee reported that Camp Bragg was not suited to the work, and reported that Camp Benning was vastly better adapted to it. The clearest testimony was presented to the committee as to the absolute necessity for such a school, no matter what the size of the Army might be. The advantages of this place were presented by officers of the Army. I want to repeat that there never was any solicitation to locate the first camp there from anybody interested in it. It was purely a military act by the officers of the Army themselves.

After the Senate Committee on Military Affairs finally voted seven to seven on reconsideration, the Secretary of War received a letter from one Senator, not present at the committee meeting, stating that as between Bragg and Benning he preferred Benning, and another Senator, who had not voted, saw the Secretary of War, and expressed the same view. I presented the letter to the Secretary of War urging that the final action of the committee left the committee with no expression of opinion on the subject, it having been a tie, and that the department could very properly proceed, if the staff thought it desirable, and complete the camp. I still think so, and I think it was a wise thing to do. Just what the present status of Benning is, I do not know. I went down there just after Congress adjourned, and went over the land. I found one of the most remarkable tracts, topographically, I ever saw—quite a quantity, about 18,000 acres, perhaps, of level land in one body, and the balance diversified highlands, lowlands, valleys, and hills with numerous springs and clear water creeks; and I understood from Col. Ames, one of the officers who made or approved the selection, who took me over it and showed it to me, that the reason of their selection was in part this unusually broken character of the land, that furnished the opportunity for such great variety of experience in movements even in land of that size. Of course, a climate giving opportunity for all year training and accessibility to population lessening cost of transportation were most important. I felt that I ought to say this much with reference to it. I do not desire to discuss the matter further.

[Letter of Senator HOKE SMITH to the Secretary of War.]

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1919.

HON. NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I wish to bring to your attention the recent action of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate and what I consider to be the attitude of that committee and of the Military Affairs Committee of the House with reference to the establishment of certain technical schools at Camp Benning, near Columbus, Ga.

Early in January, I think upon the 7th, the subject of certain camp activities was before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. At that time the scope and necessity for technical training in the Army, outside of Artillery, was not, in my opinion, fully appreciated by the committee. It certainly was not fully appreciated by me. This was due—certainly on my part and, I think, on the part of others—to the lack of that definite information as to what technical training meant and as to its great importance developed by the war with Germany.

At that time it was suggested that the Senate committee pass a resolution requesting the department to stop work on Camp Benning, and, on motion of Senator MCKELLAR, the committee unanimously voted not to proceed further with the work at Camp Benning, Ga.

At that time, also, the Camp Benning project was one which it was expected would cost upward of \$14,000,000. Additional information was obtained and submitted to the committee; plans were revised to reduce the expense to less than half of the original amount. The original plan involved the use of 17,000 acres of land immediately adjoining the city of Columbus. The necessity for this land was in part due to the pendency of the war, to the large number of men who would be trained at Camp Benning, and to the importance of extending military regulations over the city of Columbus.

This situation does not now exist, and the chamber of commerce of Columbus has agreed to protect the Government from loss on the 17,000 acres if Benning is established.

On February 2 the subject came up again before the committee, and the original resolution advising the War Department "it is the sense of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that the Fort Benning project be abandoned" was reconsidered; but subsequently, about the same time, a resolution was passed to the effect that the Committee on Military Affairs disapproved the Fort Benning project. I think it was

then the opinion that some other equally satisfactory tract might be used, where buildings had already been constructed, and the expense greatly lessened.

The only other available place with land sufficient, and located at a point where the transportation charges of the officers to and from the camp would be reasonable, and where climatic conditions would permit all-year training, was Camp Bragg.

The importance of technical training for the Infantry, for the Cavalry, for the tanks, and for the machine guns, operating together in a single field, has been urged by military experts, and Gen. Pershing has impressed the importance of such work as a result of his experience in France.

Under your direction Camp Bragg was studied. The result of this study showed that it would cost nearly as much to prepare for the school at Camp Bragg as to complete it at Camp Benning. By going on at Camp Benning we would have the Artillery School retained at Camp Bragg—so much urged by the Chief of Artillery—and we would also have Camp Benning for the technical training of Infantry, Cavalry, tanks, and machine guns and the best of facilities for both Artillery and these schools.

The report upon Camp Bragg also shows that the character of the land fails to give the opportunity for training in the schools, other than Artillery, which is really required, and that Camp Benning, selected by experts on account of its great variety of topography, will give an ideal site for these schools.

Under these circumstances, on Tuesday morning, March 4, I brought the subject to the attention again of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and asked for reconsideration of the disapproval of the Camp Benning project. Two votes were had. On one the vote stood 6 to 6. On the last the vote stood 7 to 7. While the vote was not an eye-and-nay vote, I attach a certified statement from the assistant clerk of the committee showing who were present. There were 15 Senators present. I am quite sure Senator WARREN did not vote, and that Senators CHAMBERLAIN, HITCHCOCK, WEEKS, NEW, FRELINGHUYSEN, and JOHNSON voted nay, while Senators FLETCHER, MYERS, BECKHAM, REED, KIRBY, and myself voted aye. Senator THOMAS was not present. Senator THOMAS has since by letter expressed to Mr. Crowell, and through him to the department, his preference for Camp Benning over Camp Bragg, if the school is to be established. Senator WARREN has also orally discussed the subject with Mr. Crowell, and I believe I am justified in saying that he preferred Benning to Bragg.

In the meantime the subject was before the House Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee declined to take any action, thereby leaving it entirely in the discretion of the War Department.

I submit that the final action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by a vote of 7 to 7 of those present divided the committee equally, and thereby left the subject to the War Department. Senator THOMAS having definitely expressed in writing his preference for Benning, and Senator WARREN having in effect taken the same position orally, a majority of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs carry to you an expression in favor of Benning over Bragg.

I discussed the subject with Senator CHAMBERLAIN, chairman of the committee, on yesterday, and acquainted him of my purpose to bring these facts to your attention in the manner that I am presenting them. He expressed no dissent from the course I am taking, and stated that it was not his purpose to take any action in opposition. I have also conferred with Senator MCKELLAR, who originally offered the motion condemning the project, and I find his position much modified by the new facts which have been developed, and I am quite sure he will not further oppose the projects.

Under all these facts, I feel justified in urging that the subject is up to the War Department for action without advice from either of the Committees on Military Affairs in the House or the Senate.

My own thorough study of the question has convinced me of the absolute necessity to conduct a technical school for Infantry, Cavalry, tanks, and machine guns, where cooperation and individual work may be taught, if we have an Army of any size and make it really proficient.

I am sure this conviction will grow on all as the subject is understood, and I do not hesitate to urge a completion of the Benning project.

In addition to the foregoing reasons, it is certainly worthy of consideration that the procedure of condemnation instituted last fall before the armistice was signed, coupled with the assumption of immediate ownership and possession by the Government of the area involved in the project, caused from 75 to 85 per cent of the residents of 115,000 acres of land to vacate their homes, to move to other sections, and to assume in many instances contracts which they can not perform unless the Government completes its action by paying for their land. They are suffering now from the failure to have received prompt payment.

A knowledge of their condition may have at first prompted my close investigation of this project. Now, I am thoroughly satisfied of the necessity for the school, the wisdom of the selection, and the good judgment used by the department in the action which it took.

Very cordially, yours,

(Signed) HOKE SMITH.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I hesitate to take up the time of the Senate on this matter, but I think it due to the public that something be said as to what actually took place before the committee; and, in as few words as I can, I am going to try to tell that story.

The first thing that happened was that the Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of War came before the committee on January 7 to say that the War Department had in contemplation and in partial progress the establishment of three camps—one at Fort Bragg, N. C., one at Camp Knox, Ky., and the other at Camp Benning, Ga. They said they wanted the judgment of the committee as to whether or not those camps ought to be proceeded with, the armistice having been signed and the war evidently being about over. The committee heard all they had to say about what had been done with reference to condemnation proceedings, the purchase of land from some of the owners, the removal of tenants, and all that sort of thing. After a complete statement of the facts by the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary, the committee wanted to know if they regarded all of the camps as necessary. Both replied that they thought them desirable, but as to Camp Benning they did not think it necessary, and that as between the three Camp Ben-

ning was certainly the least necessary of the three, and they thought we might very well get along without it.

The committee said its purpose was to save every dollar of public money that then could be saved; that while it might be desirable to have such a camp as was contemplated at Benning, the condition of the public, having been taxed as it had been for two years of war and as it must be for the next two or three years, was such that it was entitled to relief wherever relief could be at that time afforded, and with the full knowledge and full approval of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary the committee voted not to proceed with Camp Benning.

Mr. OWEN. How did that vote stand?

Mr. NEW. I do not remember what the first vote in the committee was.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have it here.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to have in the RECORD what the vote was.

Mr. NEW. The Senator from New York has the record and will read it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I find in the minutes of the committee, under date of February 1, 1919, this language:

The pending motion was that heretofore submitted by Senator McKELLAR, as follows:

"That the committee advise the War Department that it is the sense of the Military Affairs Committee that the Fort Benning project should be abandoned."

To this motion Senator SMITH offered the following substitute: "After considering the revised plans for the consolidated Infantry school of arms, machine-gun and tank schools at Fort Benning, Ga., as submitted by the War Department, the resolution of January 7, requesting the abandonment of Fort Benning, is hereby withdrawn and the question of proceeding with the construction under the revised and less expensive project is remitted to the War Department."

Mr. OWEN. Did the substitute pass?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In a moment.

After some consideration, a vote was had on this substitute, and the following Senators voted in the affirmative:

I find five in the affirmative and nine in the negative. The substitute was lost, and thereupon Senator MYERS proposed another substitute:

So the substitute was lost, and thereupon Senator MYERS proposed the following substitute for the McKellar motion, to wit:

"Moved that we advise the War Department to complete the payment for the land involved and to do nothing more."

By the same vote as above the motion was lost, and thereupon Senator HIRCHCOCK offered the following as an amendment to the original McKellar motion, to wit:

"That the Committee on Military Affairs, having considered the Fort Benning project and heard the testimony offered, disapprove the project."

Senator McKELLAR, with the consent of the committee, accepted the proposed amendment, and thereupon recurred this motion, which the committee adopted as an amendment.

And there were nine in the affirmative and five in the negative.

Mr. OWEN. What was the date of that action?

Mr. WADSWORTH. February 1. Then, on the morning of March 4 the committee was called in what might be termed an extraordinary session and an effort was made to reconsider the action of February 1, and that effort failed by a tie vote.

So far as the records of the committee are concerned and so far as the knowledge of practically all of the members of the committee was concerned, at that time the incident was closed.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order that there may not be any misunderstanding about it, I want to say of that meeting of the committee I was not notified, or if I was notified I did not receive the notification. As the Senator from New York said, it was an extraordinary meeting. I was not present, as the record of the meeting shows. The Senator from New York has the record, which shows that I was not present. Of course, my attitude was thoroughly understood by the motion that I offered.

Mr. NEW. I am very glad, indeed, the Senator from New York had with him the record from which he could read the exact vote taken at these meetings of the committee. I was just about to tell the story of the meeting of February 1 and the one of March 4 when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] asked for the vote. But the action of the Military Affairs Committee was taken after we had heard more witnesses than I have ever known to be summoned on any one case that has been heard before any committee of which I am a member since I have been a member of this body. We must have had at least 50 witnesses on both sides of the case, and we were thoroughly advised as to what all the conditions were. Every possible effort was made to induce the Committee on Military Affairs to reverse its action. Personal requests and every means that could possibly be employed were resorted to to induce the committee to reverse itself, but without producing that result.

The action that has been taken in proceeding with Camp Benning is absolutely in violation of the advice at least of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, to which the whole subject was referred, with the statement at the time that the future action of the War Department would be governed by the advice of that committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, in connection with the pending provision I desire to suggest to the Senate an amendment somewhat modified, which I offered last night, and which is printed in the RECORD at page 1597. The Government has leased and has an option to purchase 960 acres of land near Lonoke, Ark., and is now using that as an aviation field. The field is known as Ebert's Field. This land can be purchased under the option for \$68,000, which is a very reasonable price, if not a low price, for the land considered without regard to the buildings. The buildings which the Government has constructed on this land are worth several hundred thousand dollars. It is quite probable, at least within the range of possibility, that this field may be abandoned, and if this occurs the Government will be compelled to sell the buildings at a very great sacrifice.

The amendment which I propose is in this form:

On page 72, after line 17, insert the following: "That if in his opinion it is advisable to do so the Secretary of War may purchase 960 acres of land now under lease for an aviation field or camp site and known as Camp Eberts Field, and thereafter sell the same: *Provided*, That no sale shall be made of lands for any less amount than the cost thereof."

This will enable the Government to purchase the land at \$68,000 under its option and resell the same if it abandons the field, which I understand is in contemplation. If the amendment is not adopted, the Government will lose nearly all its investment in the buildings that are now on the land. If the purchase is made, complications connected with claims for damages growing out of the removal of buildings and other improvements taken from the lands after the Government obtained possession will be avoided.

I called the matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee and of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH], who, I understand, has given especial consideration to this subject, and asked if there is any objection to adding this proviso.

The amendment as offered last evening was a general amendment. I was informed that there would be objection to making the provision general, and I have therefore limited it to this particular case.

Mr. ASHURST. Why should there be objection to a general amendment which saves the Government much money? This is the time when we should think about saving money for the Government. Why should a general amendment be objectionable?

Mr. ROBINSON. I thought when the amendment was first offered that it should be made general; that the same condition in all probability exists at a large number of fields and perhaps at some of the cantonments. I have heard that in the sales of buildings at some of the camp sites where sales have already been made merely nominal sums have been received for buildings of very great value. I believe that if the department had the authority to sell the buildings in connection with the land, which it can only obtain by procuring title to the land, great economies would result, which, of course, are desirable.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he has read the amendment of the committee on page 72, beginning with line 16 of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON. Certainly I have read the amendment. The amendment which I propose is in the nature of an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Does the Senator not think the language of the amendment as proposed will permit the Secretary of War to sell?

Mr. ROBINSON. No, I do not. I want the express authority given the Secretary of War to buy this area of land and to resell the same if the field is abandoned in order to save the Government money. The amendment as written in the bill impliedly gives that authority, but it does not give any express authority to sell, and I think the matter should be made clear and beyond any doubt. I can not see how objection can arise on the part of any Senator who takes the view of the subject which the Senator from West Virginia seems to take.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If there is no objection from other Senators or members of the committee, I will accept the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate more than a few moments in further discussion of this Benning matter. It may be of interest to the Senate, however, to know that the original project had in mind the purchase of 126,000 acres of land. Since then the project has been reduced to 98,000 acres. They have purchased 59,283 acres and paid for it.

Eleven thousand five hundred and forty more acres have been contracted for, but the money is not yet paid. The whole project is to cost \$9,200,000. This is the project which we thought had been abandoned on March 4.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield? Were the purchases of any part of the land described made after the action of the committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Practically all of them—nearly all.

Mr. KING. So in the face of the action of the Senate the War Department proceeded to make those purchases?

Mr. WADSWORTH. According to my best information, no money had been actually paid out for the purchase of land prior to March 4. It has all been paid out since.

Mr. KING. This amendment would be a ratification of their, I was going to say, illegal, certainly their defiant, attitude?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This amendment as now printed in the bill would prevent them from buying any more, but it does not compel them to sell what they have already bought and paid for.

Mr. KING. Would it permit them to make improvements upon this project or any other project which they have bought in defiance of the wish of Congress?

Mr. WADSWORTH. You will notice the amendment reads:

That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments.

It stops further construction. The camp, including purchase of the land and construction of buildings, is about 65 per cent completed. It would seem as if they had already spent about \$5,000,000 on it. The project was to spend \$9,200,000.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] stated in his remarks to the Senate a little while ago that one or two of the members of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs of the last session were persuaded to write to the Secretary of War stating that they preferred Camp Benning to Camp Bragg if it was a choice between the two. But the fact is that they have also gone ahead with Camp Bragg as well as Camp Benning, and the Camp Bragg project is another \$10,000,000 project.

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator from New York if he thinks legislation ought to be enacted now that in any way glosses over or indorses the conduct of officials who have proceeded in such a defiant way and obviously, or apparently at least, against the best interests of the country?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not accept that definition of this amendment. The amendment makes them stop right where they are in the matter of Camp Benning. The committee did not feel that it could with beneficial result to anybody turn around and undo the whole thing and wreck the entire project. There are two interests affected—one the people who have been moved off, and the other the taxpayers of the country. This is 65 per cent completed. A large portion of the expenditures is in buildings. We do not want to destroy the value of those buildings. They belong to the taxpayers of the United States. We do want to say to them you will not build another building or buy another acre of land. That is as far as we felt we could go. It is not glossing over what was done.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. KING. May I ask one other question, if the Senator from Oklahoma will pardon me? Did not all the evidence before the committee in some of the hearings indicate that a very large number of fields for aviation and for other purposes had been acquired during the war, many of which were wholly unnecessary, but the title to which is still in the Government?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I must reply to that by saying that the committee did not have brought to its attention in any detail the status of the flying fields. Of course some are being sold and others are being kept. Frankly, I do not believe any of the flying fields would be available for target practice; I mean they would not fall under this category of Camp Benning.

Mr. KING. The Senator knows there were a great number of fields acquired in various parts of the United States notwithstanding the fact that the Government had a large number of posts and had a great many fields which were available. It seems to me the conduct of the War Department is so reprehensible, so flagrant an abuse of power, that a fitting rebuke, if one can be administered to executive officers who fly in the face of decency and honor and propriety, ought to be administered, either here or in the near future. I do not know whether we can do it in this bill, but if we can curb the ambitions and usurpations of this department I think now is a very good opportunity to do it, and we ought to make some attempt to curb the usurpations of this department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to ask the chairman of the committee who has the bill in charge if there is anything in the

bill as it passed the House or in the pending amendment which tends to diminish the use or the equipment of Fort Sill, which is an old and established fort, now owned by the Government? It is now owned by the Government and contains some 56,000 acres, and is joined by the national forest reserve, containing forty or fifty thousand acres.

Mr. OWEN. It contains 65,000 acres.

Mr. GORE. It contains 65,000 acres, as suggested by my colleague. The Wichita Mountains are situated in this reservation, which is already owned by the Government. The mountains afford a splendid background for target practice, which is such an essential requirement of a complete military reservation. The reason I ask this is that an amendment was reported by the Military Committee last winter to the bill which failed and which did react unfavorably on Fort Sill, to which I felt obliged to interpose an objection at the time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is nothing in this bill which affects Fort Sill, except in this regard: On page 4 of the bill, under the heading "United States Service Schools," the words "at Fort Sill, Okla.," are stricken from the bill as it was originally printed in connection with the term "Infantry School of Arms," the reason for that being the Infantry School of Arms has been removed from Fort Sill and is as yet unstationed in a finished condition. Part of that work was to be at Benning, but Fort Sill is to be used to its fullest capacity by the Artillery School of Fire, as it has been for some time past.

Mr. GORE. The transfer of Fort Benning was under an Executive order and not under an act of Congress?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was under an Executive order entirely; in fact, the Infantry School of Arms had not space at Fort Sill, as we are informed, if the Artillery is to have all the space it needs. Modern artillery training and practice involve the laying down of barrages 3 miles away and the maneuvering of the Infantry under the barrage; it takes an enormous space of country, and they can not have both there at the same time.

Mr. GORE. I desire to ask, does the striking out of the name "Fort Sill" in this bill affect the situation or the use of Fort Sill in any way?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all. It is still a School of Fire for Artillery.

Mr. GORE. Would the rejection of this reported amendment striking out "Fort Sill" in any way preserve the use and the importance of the post?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would have no effect. That simply relates to the Infantry School of Arms.

Mr. OWEN. Would not leaving the words "Fort Sill" out require them to put back that School of Arms at Fort Sill, which they have removed?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. It has been absent from there for some time, operating better at another place, and it would force it back there and cramp both Artillery and Infantry.

Mr. OWEN. Sixty-five thousand acres plus 56,000 acres make 121,000 acres, which is large enough undoubtedly for both. One hundred and twenty-one thousand acres is a very large piece of ground; it is many miles in extent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. A 6-inch howitzer throws a shell 8 miles.

Mr. OWEN. As I understand the size of that area, they could throw a shell 8 miles and still be well within the limit of that land.

Mr. GORE. They could throw shells 25 or 30 miles in this reservation from southeast to northwest without crowding the possibilities at all. What is the parliamentary situation? Has this amendment been adopted?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has been adopted.

Mr. GORE. What is now pending?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The real estate proviso.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I shall move to reconsider the vote by which the other amendment we were discussing in relation to Fort Sill was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment on page 4?

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not now the pending amendment.

Mr. GORE. I understand there is a pending amendment now, but I wish simply to give notice of my intention to reconsider the vote by which the other amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I presume it would be rather unprecedented, but, in view of what I conceive to be the misconduct of the War

Department in its purchases of so many places and its violation of the attitude of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, would the Senator from New York consent to an amendment by which the War Department would be restricted from making any purchases or expending any money whatever upon any of these fields without the affirmative approval of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and of the Senate? It seems that if we appropriate funds to the department, even surrounding the expenditure with such limitations as seem to be proper, it effectuates no result, and the limitations in spirit or in letter are ignored. In the light of that attitude of the War Department, it seems to me there must be some way of bringing them to an accountability and to a recognition that there is some force, some authority, superior to the War Department. While I admit that the legislation which I suggest would be unprecedented, it seems to me that legislation of that kind would be warranted when we have to deal with such a recalcitrant—I was going to say revolutionary—branch of the Government. Would the Senator from New York object to an amendment of that character?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think it would be good legislation. Neither the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate nor the Military Affairs Committee of the other House could do that work. We would have to move up and open offices in the War Department if any such thing were attempted. There are hundreds, yes thousands, of cases of the purchase of real estate contemplated under this amendment reported by the Senate committee.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, does he not mean that the War Department under this amendment would be authorized to buy hundreds or thousands of pieces of real estate?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I should like to illustrate it with one case which is typical of many others.

At Camp Lee, as I remember it—I have not the figures before me, but the subcommittee went into it and saw the figures, and if any of them have a better recollection of it than have I they can correct me—at Camp Lee, Va., there are some 62 parcels of land, and on the cantonment site the Government has either purchased and paid for or has incurred a straight obligation with an agreed price for two-thirds of those parcels. Those parcels vary in acreage from 5 acres up to 2,000 acres. As to the remaining one-third of the parcels, which would be about 20 parcels of varying sizes, checkerboarded around the cantonment, no agreement has yet been reached as to the price, and in order to protect the buildings on the cantonment and eventually some day get some value back from them, the department has commenced condemnation proceedings. We have got to permit them to do that, in my judgment.

Camp Lee is but an instance of 16 cantonments. There are many places also where we have put up munitions factories on leased land. I know of one case where a \$2,500,000 permanent concrete and steel munitions plant has been erected on land which is worth but \$5,000, which the Government is leasing. Now, we have got to buy that land or the \$2,500,000 building will tumble into the lap of the landowner or the Government would have to erect a building, and you know what the cost of erecting a building comes to in dollars and cents. There are hundreds of those cases.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, a statement such as that of the conduct of the War Department discloses a condition which seems exceedingly scandalous.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion of the Camp Benning site project I send to the desk and ask to have the Secretary read from page 304 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the Army appropriation bill a memorandum from the department giving the history of their expenditures and of their action in respect to that site.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

HISTORY OF THE INFANTRY SCHOOL OF ARMS PROJECT, NOW KNOWN AS CAMP BENNING, COLUMBUS, GA.

On August 30, 1918, upon a request from the War College, the Construction Division commenced the preparation of estimates for an infantry school of arms at Columbus, Ga., for approximately 31,000 men. On September 25, \$100,000 was authorized to be expended for a temporary tent camp for this project. This project was completed on October 8, which included five storehouses, medical infirmary, temporary water supply, and electric lights.

On October 9 the Acting Secretary of War authorized construction work in connection with the establishment of the Infantry school of arms at Columbus, based on a personnel of 3,395 men, to the amount of \$1,569,875.

On October 18, 1918, a report was made by the chief of the real estate section to the Director of Operations regarding the acquiring of 115,000 acres of land for maneuver ground.

On October 30, 1918, the Assistant Secretary of War authorized the Camp Benning project increased to a size to accommodate 25,000 men. As at this time there was a question of changing the exact location of the camp, little work was done pending this decision.

On January 8 the Secretary of War ordered the abandonment of all new construction at Camp Benning.

On March 12, 1919, the Camp Benning project was reauthorized, and it is under this authority that the present work is now going on and land purchased.

The following is a financial statement of Camp Benning, which shows the present condition of finances and completion:

Weekly report—Financial condition, Camp Benning, Ga., week ending June 7, 1919.

Total cash disbursed:			
Land	\$1,640,282.20		
Materials and labor	1,591,940.54		
			\$3,232,222.74
Obligations:			
Land	340,298.19		
Materials and labor	452,770.68		
			793,068.87
Estimated cost to complete:			
Land	877,596.33		
Materials and labor	2,252,000.00		
			3,129,596.33
Total			7,154,887.94

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what steps have been taken for the salvaging of the war materials which have been bought on so large a scale? What protection is the United States receiving?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, that matter was pretty thoroughly discussed last night and yesterday afternoon. The War Department has established the office of director of sales, whose duty it is to coordinate the sales of the surplus supplies in the hands of the Government at this time in the War Department.

Mr. OWEN. Are they safeguarding those materials or protecting them from destruction by the elements?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The best information of the committee is that they are, with the possible exception of motor trucks and passenger automobiles.

Mr. OWEN. I heard at Fort Sill the statement made by a reputable citizen there that a large amount of supplies were lying out in the open weather—window sash, doors, and things of that sort—which are more or less perishable when exposed to the elements.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not give the Senator any information about that particular place. We had information to the contrary, except with respect to trucks and automobiles, which, under a law passed by Congress, are to be turned over to the Agricultural Department, to be distributed all over the country in aiding the building of good roads. Some of those trucks and automobiles are out in the open weather, although we are assured that at proper intervals the motors are turned over and also kept oiled. That is all the information I have.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the bill providing for the conservation of food and fuel—H. R. 4961—was passed in the Senate, July 26, 1917, the Senate adopted an amendment by a vote of 53 to 31 which I offered, pages 53 and 63, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, authorizing a legislative committee to keep itself informed with regard to war expenditures, as follows:

SEC. 23. A joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be appointed, composed of five Members of the Senate, including three Democrats and two Republicans, and five Members of the House of Representatives, including three Democrats and two Republicans, to be known as "the joint committee on expenditures in the conduct of the war."

It shall be the duty of said committee to keep itself advised with regard to the expenditure of all appropriations bearing on the conduct of the war made by Congress and the contracts relating thereto made by officers of the executive departments, and it shall be the duty of the executive departments, on request, to keep said committee fully advised as to such expenditures and contracts.

Such committee shall confer and advise with the President of the United States and the heads of the various executive departments, commissions, voluntary boards, or other organizations connected with the conduct of the war, with a view to safeguarding expenditures, and shall report to Congress from time to time, in its own discretion or when requested to do so by either branch of Congress.

The membership of such committee shall be designated by the respective committees of the Senate and House which select the members of the regular standing committees.

Such committee shall have power to act by subcommittee or otherwise and to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such clerical, expert, and stenographic assistance as shall be necessary; and to pay the necessary expenses of such committee there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$50,000, to be paid out upon the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said committee.

The purpose of that amendment was to prevent the very waste with which we are now confronted, by using the moral influence of the committee. It passed the Senate by a very substantial vote, but was stricken out in the House because of the hostility of certain representatives of the executive department, who did

not wish to be restrained, and who denounced and ridiculed the proposed committee as a "smelling committee" and as equivalent to a vote of "no confidence" in the President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator might just as well say it was the hostility of the President.

Mr. OWEN. I decline to put the responsibility on the President. I believe it was largely due to other people and other interests. The President of the United States, however, can not in the nature of the case be omniscient; he is obliged to depend upon the advice of the trusted men who surround him. It is the settled policy of all great governments that the chief executive or head of the government is protected from the charge that he is personally responsible for everything that occurs, and the responsibility is properly and justly put upon his ministry, where it really belongs, and who may be held responsible without upsetting the smooth conduct of the government. I think it worth while to call attention of the Senate now to that amendment, which was drawn by me for the purpose of protecting the taxpayers of this country against the extraordinary wastefulness and extravagance during war on the part of the executive departments, and the Senate's effort to protect the country. I wish to wash my hands of the responsibility.

I offered another amendment at the same time for an administrative court, providing a means to hold officials to immediate responsibility for malfeasance and bad behavior, as follows:

There is hereby authorized and established a court to be known as the "official court," to consist of one judge for each judicial circuit of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the terms of said judges at the beginning of the service to be from one to nine years, respectively, to be determined by lot, and thereafter each successor shall hold for the term of nine years unless sooner removed for cause by the President.

The salary of each judge shall be \$6,000 annually. The judge of the official court shall have jurisdiction over every case of malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, or neglect of duty in office of any employee, adviser, committeeman, or officer appointed under the authority of the United States except members of the President's Cabinet and Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, with power to issue summonses for witnesses, to require the production of evidence, to punish for contempt, and render judgment on questions involving official misconduct, and issue writs necessary to carry out the authority herein given. The marshal of the United States District Court shall serve the writs of the judges of the official court.

Any person, natural or corporate, upon filing bonds for the costs of the suit shall have the right to enter a complaint against any such employee of the United States for malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, or serious neglect of official duty. The judge of the official court shall impose a fine not exceeding \$5,000 upon the complainant where the complaint is frivolous or insincere. The costs of the proceeding shall fall upon the complainant if not sustained and upon the defendant if sustained.

Upon such complaint being filed, the judge within whose circuit such complaint is made shall immediately require the evidence to be submitted orally and recorded or by depositions within 10 days from the date of the filing of the complaint, except upon special order where compliance is impossible, and within 10 days from receiving such evidence the judge shall make his findings.

There is hereby authorized an appellate official court to consist of three justices, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The appellate official court shall make rules and regulations and determine forms of procedure for the official court and for appeals therefrom; shall have power to issue such writs as may be necessary to exercise its jurisdiction; and shall sit in Washington City, D. C.

All appeals to the appellate official court shall be made within five days from date of the publication of the judgment of the judge of the official court and shall be passed upon within 30 days of the receipt thereof.

The appellate official court justices shall hold office for a period of nine years, one for three years, one for six years, and one for nine years, to be determined by lot, and thereafter each justice shall be appointed for a term of nine years and shall have original jurisdiction over cases arising in the District of Columbia.

The appellate justices shall receive a salary of \$7,500 annually.

In the event of a final judgment by the official court against an employee or officer of the United States, he shall have the option of resigning within five days of the rendition of the final judgment. In the event his resignation is not submitted, the office shall be declared vacant and filled by a new incumbent.

The dismissal from office under the proceedings herein authorized shall not preclude a trial or conviction under the criminal code where a violation of the statutes is exposed.

This amendment should have been adopted. It is badly needed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Oklahoma, in connection with the waste of material and lack of care of material, that there are 52,000 bales of cotton at the plant at Nitro that have been exposed to the weather ever since last fall, and are still there lying on the ground.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who wish to vote upon this amendment, and, reluctant as I am to do so, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Henderson	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Stanley
Colt	Kellogg	Norris	Sterling
Cummins	Kendrick	Nugent	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	Overman	Thomas
Dial	Keyes	Page	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Phelan	Wadsworth
Elkins	Kirby	Phipps	Walsh, Mass.
France	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Ransdell	Warren
Gore	Lenroot	Sheppard	Watson
Gronna	Lodge	Sherman	Williams
Hale	McCormick	Simmons	Wolcott
Harding	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. KING. I desire to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon this amendment I want to call attention to a clipping which I have from the Columbus Dispatch under date of June 17, 1919. I invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to this statement. It appears that immediately after the amendment was offered by Representative KAHN in the House to restrain the War Department from making real estate purchases, it sent Maj. J. J. McConnell, Army paymaster, to one particular place to purchase additional land or to consummate executory contracts. It would seem that this was done for the purpose of flouting Congress and showing the utter contempt of the department for any expression of opinion by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, or any contemplated action by the House of Representatives. The statement of the paper in question is as follows:

Maj. J. J. McConnell, Army paymaster, arrived in Camp Sherman and by Monday evening over \$500,000 had been paid to landowners in the form of Federal vouchers. No grass has grown, it appears, beneath the War Department's feet. During the past seven days, said McConnell, he has paid out over \$5,000,000 in the purchase of Camps Lee, Taylor, Pike, Sherman, and Travis. He said that Pike brought \$12 an acre, Custer \$62, Travis \$500, and Taylor, which thrusts a wedge into Louisville's choicest residence district, \$550. The largest individual check to a Ross County landowner, he said, was for \$105,900.

This merely indicates, Mr. President, the attitude of the War Department. There are officials there who seem to be obsessed with the idea that lands must be purchased wherever they can be bought, whether needed by the Government for military purposes or not. Millions of dollars have been wasted in the purchase of unnecessary lands and in the erection of unnecessary buildings. I think somebody in the War Department ought to be punished for this misconduct and for this willful and wanton expenditure of public funds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. PITTMAN. I should like to have the amendment stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

The SECRETARY. On line 15 it is proposed to insert:

That if in his opinion it is advisable to do so, the Secretary of War may purchase 960 acres of land now under lease for an aviation field or camp site, known as Ebert's Field, and thereafter sell the same: *Provided*, That no sale shall be made of lands for any less amount than the cost thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the question is on the committee amendment on lines 16 to 21.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senator from New York. I should like to move a reconsideration or ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment on page 4, with relation to Fort Sill, was adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to reconsider.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I merely wish to say this in regard to the proposed amendment:

The chairman of the committee stated a few minutes ago, in explanation of it, that it would lead to the increased use of Fort Sill. If that judgment is correct, of course I shall be

very strongly in favor of the amendment. There is no fort in the country that is better equipped as a military reservation or adapted to more varied uses than Fort Sill. I happen to live within a few miles of the reservation. In the military reservation proper and the forest reserve there are 121,000 acres. The Wichita Mountains are situated within this reserve, and, as I suggested a few minutes ago, they make an excellent background for target practice. I should say that from southeast to northwest the two reservations are 25 miles in extent. There can be no crowding of this reservation. I understand that the School of Infantry has already been removed from Fort Sill. It seems to be now rather in the clouds—nowhere in particular.

I wish to repeat that if this amendment would lead to the increased use of Fort Sill and that splendid reservation I shall be for it. Everybody realizes the rush under which we are obliged to legislate at this time. The desire to secure the passage of this bill before the expiration of the fiscal year on June 30 denies us an opportunity to make as full an investigation as we otherwise would do and would like to do. For my own part I should like to have this matter go over until the next session in order that I may have a better opportunity to investigate the exact facts of this amendment on Fort Sill and its use for military purposes. I say that if it is to lead to its increased use I shall be very strongly in favor of the amendment.

I therefore hope the committee amendment will be rejected at this time.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, just a word of explanation:

Prior to our entrance into the war the Fort Sill Reservation was used in a very small way, by comparison with recent developments, as a School of Fire for Artillery, and also to a certain extent, as I remember, for Infantry. When we went into the war the Artillery became so tremendously important, and the School of Fire for that branch had to be so tremendously expanded, that, according to the best information I can get—and I have talked with many Army officers who have no prejudice at all—the Artillery School of Fire practically crowded the Infantry School of Fire to such an extent at Fort Sill that the Infantry School of Fire could not be carried on there advantageously.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the area of those two properties owned by the Government makes a tract of country of 200 square miles, so that there is the greatest possible abundance of room for both of these services; and the plea that there is not room enough is obviously without any foundation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. Two hundred square miles is not a very big territory in these days, with guns that carry 8 and 10 miles.

Mr. OWEN. It is 10 miles one way, and 20 miles the other.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And, in addition to that, it is not only the area that was regarded as insufficient for the two schools together, but the facilities, particularly water—

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. If I may be permitted just to close my statement, I shall not occupy the time of the Senate any longer.

Mr. GORE. Just in regard to the water, I will say to the Senator that the dam has recently been increased in height 10 feet. Before that increase in the dam was made, an area of 1,100 acres was embraced in the lake; and I think since the dam has been increased 10 feet, I believe at the expense of the city government, there can not be any possibility of a lack of sufficient water. That problem is solved.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is the situation so far as I know it: The use of Fort Sill is not going to be lessened. In fact, it is going to have more men stationed there and more training done there than was ever done prior to our entrance into the war; but it will be Artillery, instead of attempting to have both Artillery and Infantry. That is my understanding of it.

I hope the amendment of the committee will be sustained, because if it is not it will force the return of the Infantry School of Arms to Fort Sill, where the best men that the committee could consult with say it can not be advantageously conducted.

Mr. OWEN. Are these the same gentlemen who are expending these sums?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at all. These are artillerymen and infantrymen.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to be informed with regard to the kind of advice we are getting from the War Department. I do not feel that we have been very well safeguarded in the advice that we have received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Presiding Officer state this question? We are now voting on the original committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the original committee amendment. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 73, after line 1, to strike out "cantonments: *And provided further*, That no part of the appropriations made in this bill shall be available for the salary or pay of any officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and the completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this bill be available to pay any premium or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant: *And provided further*," and to insert "cantonments," so as to read:

No part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House provision that is stricken out has been in the military appropriation bill for the last four years. It prevents the use of stop watches or other time-measuring instruments. Every Senator is familiar with it. I think it ought to be retained in the bill, and I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in all probability this amendment will be voted down. It has been made by the Military Affairs Committee, I think, every time it has had a similar bill before it since I have been a member of the committee, only to be reinserted upon the floor.

I do not intend to occupy the time of the Senate in what I know would be a useless discussion of the merits of the amendment. It has been done with annual regularity heretofore, but the influences behind the House provision have always proven effective.

The amendment is designed to prevent the use of any agency the purpose of which is to ascertain and measure productive efficiency. It is said that in private enterprises these agencies have been abused, and that the capacity of the most efficient has been made the standard of capacity for all. It never has been used in any of the Government industrial institutions.

It never can and it never will be, because there is a minimum wage for all employees of the Government, which before the war was better than the average minimum wage in private establishments. It was designed and created before this amendment made its appearance not only to increase general efficiency without injuring in the slightest degree any workmen who might fall behind in production, but it enabled a great many intelligent and skillful workmen to increase their compensation to a very marked degree. I recall that two or three years ago when this subject was before the Senate upon motion of the late Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Gallinger, he and I read a number of communications from Government employees at different places in the country, those presented by myself coming from the Frankford Arsenal and written in protest against the inclusion in the bill of this provision. Some of them stated that with their extra compensation and because of the fact that they were probably able to continue obtaining it indefinitely they had purchased homes upon the installment plan and were engaged in making payments through their dependence upon this source of revenue, and many of them expressed the apprehension that they might not be able to comply with their contracts if this source of compensation were taken from them. That being the case, and in the interest of the Government, there being no possibility of a corresponding injury to anybody, this provision should not appear in any of our supply bills.

The proviso beginning on line 16 has no place in the bill if the proviso which the committee want to strike out is to be restored. It reads:

That no part of the moneys appropriated in each or any section of this act shall be used or expended for the purchase or acquirement of any article or articles that, at the time of the proposed acquirement, can be manufactured or produced in each or any of the Government arsenals of the United States for a sum less than they can be purchased or procured otherwise.

The proviso preceding makes it impossible to manufacture or produce in any Government arsenal anything for a sum less than it can be purchased or procured otherwise. It is a contradiction in terms. Why it is there I can not understand, but with the previous proviso excluded from the bill it becomes cogent, reasonable, and logical. As the two stand together, the one makes economic production impossible while the other provides that nothing shall be purchased on the outside which can be manufactured by the Government for a sum less than the amount of such purchase. I think, Mr. President, that the proviso should be excluded and the amendment proposed should be agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, it seems there are two different subjects treated in the proviso which the committee recommends to be stricken out. One deals with the stop-watch system and the other deals with the bonus system. I should like to have those questions submitted separately, and I ask that that portion of the committee amendment commencing on line 2 and extending down to and including the word "work," in line 10, be submitted first and then that the rest of the amendment be submitted separately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). Is there any objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand the vote must be taken first on the stop-watch proposition and second on the bonus proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the case.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I request the yeas and nays on both propositions.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Before the roll is called, I understand a vote "yea" sustains the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. ASHURST. As I understand the situation now parliamentarily, it is to agree to so much of the amendment as is embraced within lines 2 down to and including the word "work," in line 10. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I understand a vote "yea" strikes out the House provision as to stop-watch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. MCKELLAR. And so a vote "yea" would strike out the House provision as to the bonus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. And a vote "nay" is to retain the House provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; to retain it. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the first part of the amendment of the committee to strike out.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Mr. President, I am paired with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I am informed that I can transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I transfer my pair to that Senator and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WATSON. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Has the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with that Senator and for that reason withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FALL. I inquire if the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FALL. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I notice that my pair the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is not present. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I wish to inquire if the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STEELING] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "nay."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence I

transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask if the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have a general pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. FERNALD. I inquire if the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. FERNALD. In his absence I withhold my vote, being paired with that Senator.

Mr. NEW. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is detained upon official business.

Mr. KIRBY. My colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN];

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—20.

Colt	Hale	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Edge	Harding	New	Spencer
Elkins	Keyes	Newberry	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	King	Page	Wadsworth
Gronna	McCumber	Phipps.	Williams

NAYS—33.

Ashurst	Harrison	McCormick	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Henderson	McKellar	Stanley
Capper	Hitchcock	McNary	Trammell
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Underwood
Cummins	Kenyon	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Kirby	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
France	La Follette	Ransdell	
Gay	Lenroot	Sheppard	
Harris	Lodge	Shields	

NOT VOTING—43.

Ball	Gerry	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gore	Overman	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Smoot
Brandeggee	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Sterling
Calder	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Sutherland
Culbertson	Kellogg	Poindexter	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Pomerene	Townsend
Dillingham	Knox	Reed	Warren
Fall	McLean	Robinson	Watson
Fernald	Martin	Sherman	Wolcott
Fletcher	Myers	Simmons	

So the first division of the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the second division of the amendment of the committee striking out the part relative to the premium or bonus.

Mr. MCKELLAR. As I understand it, the yeas and nays have been ordered on that also?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). Has the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LODGE. Making the same transfer as before, of my pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], I vote "yea."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM. Has the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence withhold my vote.

Mr. NEW. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] is detained on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON, after having voted in the negative). The Chair announces that he has a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. He transfers that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] and lets his vote stand.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. He is not present in the Chamber at this time, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a pair with that Senator, and in his absence I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

The roll call resulted—yeas 27, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—27.			
Ashurst	Gronna	New	Thomas
Chamberlain	Hale	Newberry	Underwood
Colt	Harding	Page	Wadsworth
Edge	Hitchcock	Philpps	Watson
Elkins	Keyes	Pittman	Williams
Fernald	Lodge	Shields	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	
NAYS—22.			
Borah	Harrison	La Follette	Stanley
Capper	Henderson	Lenroot	Trammell
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
France	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	Kenyon	Nugent	
Harris	Kirby	Ransdell	
NOT VOTING—47.			
Ball	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Smith, Md.
Brandegge	Kellogg	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Kendrick	Penrose	Smoot
Culberson	King	Phelan	Spencer
Curtis	Knox	Poindexter	Sterling
Dial	McCormick	Pomerene	Sutherland
Dillingham	McCumber	Reed	Swanson
Fall	McLean	Robinson	Townsend
Fletcher	McNary	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	Martin	Sherman	

So the second division of the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I reserve a separate vote on the amendment when the bill gets into the Senate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In line 15, at the end of the line appears the word "cantonnments" in italics. That should appear following the word "or," at the end of line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the word "cantonnments" will remain at the end of line 2 and be stricken out at the end of line 15.

The next amendment was, on page 73, after line 22, to insert:

That the several organizations of the War Department, with their powers and duties as defined in orders and regulations in force and effect on November 11, 1918, shall be continued until a reorganization of the Army is effected by statutes of Congress duly approved.

That officers of the emergency Army appointed to the Officers' Reserve Corps may be appointed therein to the grade held by them in the emergency Army, or higher grade, as the Secretary of War may direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, after line 6, to insert:

CHAPTER I.

Memorial archway at Vicksburg, Miss.: That there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the unexpended balance of an appropriation under the deficiency appropriation act for 1916, approved September 8, 1916, for the national memorial reunion and peace jubilee, held at Vicksburg, Miss., which unexpended balance is understood to be about \$35,000, for the purpose of securing designs and plans for, and the construction of, a memorial archway to be erected at the intersection of Clay Street, extended, in the said city of Vicksburg, within the bounds of the Vicksburg National Military Park.

Sec. 2. That the aforesaid memorial archway shall be constructed under the supervision and approval of the Secretary of War, and the work shall be committed to a commission, to be known as the "Vicks-

burg Memorial Arch Commission," composed of three members who served in the Civil War and participated in the siege and defense of Vicksburg in 1863. One of the members shall be the president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, who served in the Federal Army; one shall be the chairman of the Vicksburg National Park Commission; and one shall be a resident of the State of Mississippi, who served in the Confederate Army, and who shall be designated by the governor of the State of Mississippi. The duties of the commission shall be to secure appropriate designs and plans for the said archway, to select and employ the architects and sculptors for the erection of the same, and to make contracts therefor, not exceeding the available amount herein appropriated. The members of the commission shall receive no compensation. After the dedication thereof, the said structure shall become a part of the National Military Park at Vicksburg and be under the control of the Vicksburg National Park Commission.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I move to amend chapter 1, on page 74, by striking out all that part beginning with the word "That," in line 8, down to and including the words "Military Park," in line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof the matter which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the committee amendment in chapter 1, line 8, after the name "Mississippi," it is proposed to strike out:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the unexpended balance of an appropriation under the deficiency appropriation act for 1916, approved September 8, 1916, for the national memorial reunion and peace jubilee, held at Vicksburg, Miss., which unexpended balance is understood to be about \$35,000, for the purpose of securing designs and plans for and the construction of a memorial archway to be erected at the intersection of Clay Street, extended, in the said city of Vicksburg, within the bounds of the Vicksburg National Military Park.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me a very few minutes, I want to explain just what this amendment is intended to accomplish.

A few years ago there was organized an association known as the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans. That association was composed of soldiers of the South and of the North. It was intended to prepare for a celebration of the North and the South to be held at Vicksburg. A Union soldier, named Capt. F. A. Roziene, was chosen as the president of the association. He at once devoted all his time and his strength to the project of getting together the soldiers of the North and of the South for the purpose of holding this probably last celebration and last memorial that will ever occur in which the veterans of both sides of that great war will participate. He is an old man; I think he is 84 years old. He is a poor man; that is to say, he is not a needy man, but he has no fortune whatever.

The bill as I introduced it, and as it is partly found in the committee amendment, provides for a reimbursement to him of \$3,000 as a part of the expenses which he incurred in preparing for the celebration at Vicksburg, and especially in interesting Congress for the purpose of securing an appropriation to aid in the jubilee, as it was called in the literature of the old veterans.

Congress did appropriate, I think, \$100,000 or \$150,000 to be spent under the direction of the Secretary of War; but so careful and saving were all of them that there remains of the appropriation which was made, I think, in 1915 or 1916 about \$35,000.

When these old veterans met at Vicksburg—and it was one of the most notable occasions of that or any other year—they not only had a delightful time among themselves but I think they helped to perpetuate a sentiment which does a great deal for American citizenship and unity throughout the country. At a meeting of these veterans there was passed a resolution which I shall read, because I do not want anybody to think that this old man is at the door of Congress begging for a reimbursement of the expenses which he necessarily incurred. I say now that he is not asking the reimbursement; he has never asked the reimbursement. It is asked on his behalf by the men who enjoyed the occasion which he was largely, if not wholly, instrumental in bringing about. This is the resolution which was adopted at Vicksburg on the 18th of October, 1917:

Whereas Comrade F. A. Roziene, president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, has by his personal efforts exerted in every honorable way possible, working both in season and out, traveling to Washington to speak before congressional committees, and throughout the length and breadth of the land to labor with State legislatures, paying in the meantime all his expenses for travel, clerical hire, and postage, he makes this great patriotic and fraternal reunion of the Blue and the Gray possible, all for the sake of the good it would do, and all this in spite of the weight upon him of more than 80 years; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do hereby express to our good Comrade Roziene our heartfelt thanks for his good spirit and his persistent, generous, and loyal efforts to bring about this happy reunion of the Blue and the Gray; and be it further

Resolved, That we here assembled, Union and Confederate Vicksburg Veterans, hereby most earnestly urge upon the Congress of the United States an appropriation of \$3,000 to repay in part the expense to which Comrade Roziene has put himself to make possible this patriotic and praiseworthy reunion in perfect harmony of the men who 50 years ago bravely fought one another for principles upon which they honestly disagreed but are now happily reunited.

I have brought this resolution to the attention of the Senate, because I know that one is apt to think of a man like Capt. Roziene as a lobbyist, as one who is endeavoring to secure an appropriation in his own interest and in his own behalf. This brave old soldier never occupied a position of that character. His work was purely altruistic before; it is altruistic still, and he does not suggest the reimbursement which my bill originally provided and which my amendment now proposes to incorporate in the proposal of the committee. I ask it in behalf of the thousands of Confederate and Union veterans who gathered in Vicksburg in 1917 and made the occasion one of the most memorable this country has ever seen. I ask it on their behalf, for they desire the reimbursement that is proposed in this amendment.

I may say that the Committee on Military Affairs recommended that part of the measure that I proposed which relates to the appropriation of \$32,000 for the erection of a memorial archway on one of the highways leading into the great National Military Park at Vicksburg. For that I am very appreciative and very grateful, and I think it is wise; but I do beg the Senate to allow the prayer of these veterans and to reimburse this old man for the expenses which he incurred in these years of hard and weary struggle to bring about the reunion, which proved to be so happy and fortunate an event. It does not increase the appropriation. The recommendation of the veterans was that the \$35,000 which remained unexpended should be divided, \$3,000 to be used in the reimbursement of which I have spoken, and \$32,000 in the construction of the memorial archway to commemorate the valor of the men who made the siege of Vicksburg immortal.

I have nothing more to say about it. I hope the amendment which I have suggested will be adopted, as it has no other effect upon the proposal of the committee than to take \$3,000 of this money, and use it for the purpose of reimbursement, leaving \$32,000 of unexpended appropriation for the construction of the memorial archway.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] will prevail. About four years ago, I think it was, I met Col. Roziene for the first time. He is not a citizen of my State; he is a citizen of the great city of Chicago. I met him here in Washington in company with an ex-Confederate soldier, one of the best men I ever knew, Capt. Webb, from my State, working on this plan for this peace jubilee to be held at Vicksburg in 1917. They appeared before the committee. I saw them afterwards at Vicksburg, Miss., working on the plans and creating a sentiment for this jubilee, and then afterwards here again, asking Congress to pass appropriate legislation for the holding of this great event. Congress appropriated \$150,000, as has been stated by the Senator from Iowa, for the purpose.

I attended the celebration at Vicksburg. I was never more impressed in my life than by the gathering of those men, there from the North and from the South on that occasion. For several days in tents and on the campus, in hotels and along the streets, they ate and slept together, talking over the old days, and all I am sure had a wonderfully good time. There must have been 10,000 ex-Union soldiers there from the North and thousands of Confederate soldiers were there from the South. The heart of Vicksburg was never more warmed than on that occasion. She outdid herself. Her hospitality was unbounded, her welcome refreshing. The people of my State and of the South were delighted that that jubilee was held and held at Vicksburg.

I live at a place called Belvoir, which was the last home of the ex-president of the Confederacy. I vote in a building where Jefferson Davis once wrote his memoirs. His former home is now occupied by the Confederate veterans of Mississippi; it is cared for by the State and by the daughters and sons of the Confederacy. To attend this jubilee I think every soldier in the Belvoir Home—certainly those who could get there—went on a special train. They enjoyed it wonderfully.

As I understand, there are \$35,000 unexpended with which it is proposed to erect this archway at this most prominent street of that historic city, the one that leads into this beautiful national park. We could not spend the money to better advantage, and I am glad that the Senator from Iowa has seen fit to offer his amendment, and that he has changed it from the committee amendment so as to provide that \$3,000 of the appropriation shall go to this gallant old gentleman from Chicago. When I saw him here so frequently and afterwards in Mississippi I did not know that he was spending money out of his own pocket, but I did know of the enthusiasm and the vigor he displayed for this great work and this great event; and I am sure I voice the sentiments of every old Confederate soldier at least when I express the hope that the Federal Congress will make

this appropriation of \$3,000 out of the unexpended balance to go to Col. Roziene. I hope that the committee will accept the substitute and that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment as proposed to the committee amendment should prevail. The celebration at Vicksburg was desirable; it was had; it was a great occasion, and was thoroughly enjoyed. The Government of the United States came forward with a liberal hand and contributed \$150,000 toward its success. After it has succeeded and passed into history as a memorable event we are asked now to expend the balance of the appropriation—for what purpose? No suggestion was made heretofore that the balance of this appropriation should be used in the erection of an arch at the entrance to the national park at Vicksburg until it was thought advisable to pay the gentleman who promoted the scheme \$3,000 for the services that he rendered. He did not expect, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has said, when he rendered this service that the Government would repay him the money. He did not tell the people and Congress that he had lobbied here for a measure that he thought might cement the friendship between the old veterans who had fought each other in the Civil War. It was not expected that he should have any of this money. Now, why dim the glory of that achievement by paying to this man \$3,000 for doing something for which he did not expect to receive compensation—for lobbying here before Congress to get \$150,000?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure that the Senator does not desire to do Col. Roziene an injustice. I recall having met the old gentleman about three or four months ago, and he wrote me at least a year ago suggesting that it would be a splendid idea if they could spend the unexpended balance for this memorial archway. He never said a word about himself. He is too much of a man to suggest it. This is not compensation for any services he rendered; it is to reimburse him for money he expended.

Mr. KIRBY. The committee propose to provide the money for the archway.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not believe he ever suggested to anybody that he wanted any money out of it. I think it is due to the spirit of the Senator from Iowa and the suggestions of ex-Confederate and Union soldiers, his comrades, if you please, that this \$3,000 is proposed to be expended for the purposes indicated.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have read the origin of the proposal. It came from the assembled veterans at Vicksburg. It is not compensation for any services rendered by Capt. Roziene.

Mr. KIRBY. The amendment so states.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is simply a partial reimbursement to him for expenses incurred in bringing about the celebration or the jubilee. He has not proposed anything of that kind, but it is a generous, decent thing to do, in my opinion, not only because of its innate justice, but because the people who were there and who enjoyed the opportunity which he had been largely instrumental in presenting to them asked that it be done. It seems to me that it is just as proper to return a part of his expenses as it is to pay out of the Treasury any other part of the expenses of the jubilee.

Mr. KIRBY. The committee thought, owing to the peculiar wording of the amendment, that he should be paid \$3,000 for bringing the matter to the attention of Congress and of the public that it was virtually to reimburse him for the activity he displayed in procuring the appropriation for the purpose for which it was used.

Mr. CUMMINS. Not entirely so.

Mr. KIRBY. It seemed so from the language of the measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. Capt. Roziene was chosen president of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans. The purpose of that association was to arrange for a celebration at Vicksburg in the form of a memorial of the old days. To that end Capt. Roziene, who had been chosen president, traveled all over the country arousing interest in it, seeking aid from the legislatures of the various States, and organizing both North and South, so that a full attendance could be secured. It is furthest from my thought that there should be any recompense for services, but, as I have remarked, he is an old man; he is a poor man; but his enthusiasm led him to an expenditure which he can ill afford to bear. It is a mere matter of whether the generosity of Congress will consider that expenditure a part of the expense of the jubilee and do something to the restoration of Capt. Roziene of

money which he has expended. He has expended a large amount in excess of \$3,000. He worked at this for four or five years before he was finally successful.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. KIRBY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, to reinforce, as well as I may, what has been said by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and what has been done by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] in connection with this appropriation, I desire to say that Col. Roziene, of the State of Iowa, one of the bravest and truest Federal soldiers who ever trod shoe leather, cooperated with Gen. Stephen D. Lee, who was at that time alive and was the last living lieutenant general of the Confederate Army and who had had command of the wonderful Confederate artillery in the defense of Vicksburg.

They secured the appropriation to which reference has been made. There was to be a great reunion of the Blue and the Gray, and, by the way, not only the Blue and the Gray came to Vicksburg but the sons of the Blue and the sons of the Gray came. Nobody has done a more valuable work in the conciliation of the sections of this country than Col. Roziene, and nobody deserves recognition more highly than he does in every way. He has been broad-minded, nonpartisan, nonsectional, and has been the good, true, honest soldier after the war was over that he had been while the war was on.

I happened to have had a conversation one night with Gen. Stephen D. Lee, whom I mentioned a moment ago as the last lieutenant general of the Confederacy living at that time, and he told me that no man had ever impressed him as more true and honest, straight and brave, than Col. Roziene. I hope that the Senate will not accidentally or incidentally pass any provision or omit any provision which might possibly be construed into a rebuke of him.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I have said about all I care to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. KIRBY. I make the point of order against this amendment that it is not germane to the bill and is general legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am totally unfamiliar with the rules of the Senate, but it does seem to me that when a point of order is made it ought to be made when the amendment is read. After all this debate, certainly a point of order ought not to lie. I repeat, I am not altogether familiar with the rules of the Senate, but after an amendment has been discussed for several minutes and then agreed to by the Senate, certainly it is too late to raise a point of order.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not recognize the merit of the objection made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. The amendment as amended had not been agreed to, and before a vote had been taken on it I raised the point of order. However, on account of the request made by some Senators, I withdraw the point of order, and if the Senate sees fit to adopt the amendment I shall have nothing further to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas withdraws his point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 75, after line 16, to insert:

CHAPTER II.

Disposal of real property by sale, exchange, lease, or otherwise: That the President is hereby authorized, through the head of any executive department, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by him or such head of department, to sell, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of real property or any interest therein or appurtenant thereto acquired by the United States of America since April 6, 1917, for storage purposes for the use of the Army, which in the judgment of the President or the head of such department is no longer needed for use by the United States of America, and to execute and deliver in the name of the United States and in its behalf any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effectuate any such sale, exchange, lease, or other disposal.

Sec. 2. That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of any such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts" and a full report of the same shall be submitted annually to Congress.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, this amendment is subject to a point of order, but I have no desire to make it if the chairman of the committee will accept an amendment limiting

the authority to sales or leases. I do not think that we ought to commit to the War Department the general authority to make exchanges, to trade in real estate. I have not any idea that in any case it would result to the benefit of the Government if such exchanges were made. I approve the authority given to the President or the head of any department to make a sale or a lease of property, but that is as far as I think we ought to go. I shall make the point of order unless such an amendment as I have indicated can be agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, Mr. President, I understand the significance of the point of order. It would probably be sustained, and the whole thing would go out; but I think it is due to the War Department and to the committee to say just a word in explanation.

This matter was first brought to the attention of the Military Affairs Committee at the last session of Congress when Gen. Goethals, who at that time was Assistant Chief of Staff and head of the Division of Purchase, Storage and Traffic, came before the committee and very strenuously urged the insertion of this language in the military appropriation bill of that session. He put especial emphasis upon the word "exchange," because a situation had arisen, as I recollect, in the city of Chicago, where the Government had put up a large freezer plant at an approximate cost of \$3,300,000. The plant was finished just as the war ended, which, incidentally, was the history of a great many of our transactions. If I recollect correctly, Gen. Goethals was exceedingly anxious to get the authority not only to lease and to sell, but to exchange, because an opportunity, as he said, presented itself to the Government to trade that plant for an ordinary storage plant near by, which would be of real value to the Government and which it could not get in any other way. It would be infinitely preferable to purchasing the ordinary storage plant, because by making the trade, the exchange of real estate, the Government could get rid of something it did not want and could not use and get something that it did want and could use. Of course, however, if the Senator from Wisconsin insists upon the point of order, I will have to consent to striking out the word "exchange." I have here a letter from the Secretary of War addressed to me, under date of June 6, which does not go into the Chicago matter as fully as Gen. Goethals did at the time, but which I think it is due the Secretary to have printed in the RECORD, without reading, as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 6, 1919.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WADSWORTH: I am submitting for the consideration of the Military Committee of the Senate a provision which I desire to have embodied either in the Army appropriation bill or such other bill as the committee may deem practicable at this time. This provision is designed to remedy a situation in which the War Department finds itself without statutory power to dispose of surplus realty acquired under urgent necessity during the war. The continued possession of such property will involve useless expenditure of funds for maintenance and very frequently a substantial loss through depreciation.

A concrete example of the general case stated above is the erection by the War Department of a large freezer plant at Chicago, Ill. Work was begun upon this plant in August, 1918, and the plant completed in March, 1919, at an approximate cost of \$3,300,000. The War Department now has no use for this plant, and did existing law permit could dispose of it to commercial interests with advantage.

The provision by which it is proposed to remedy this situation is as follows:

"The President is hereby authorized, through the head of any executive department, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by him, or such head of department, to sell, exchange, lease, or otherwise dispose of real property or any interest therein or appurtenant thereto acquired by the United States of America since April 6, 1917, for storage purposes for the use of the Army, which, in the judgment of the President or the head of such department, is no longer needed for use by the United States of America, and in its behalf, any and all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effectuate any such sale, exchange, lease, or other disposal."

Very truly, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether he should not add to his amendment a provision that in connection with every sale or exchange made a report should be made to some person or somebody, so that Congress ultimately might be advised of the transaction?

Mr. LENROOT. That had not occurred to me, but I shall be very glad to support the amendment if the Senator will draw it.

Mr. President, I offer to amend line 18 by striking out the word "exchange" and inserting the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Immediately following, on lines 18 and 19, I move to strike out the words "or otherwise."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On line 22, I move to strike out the word "exchange" and insert "or," and to strike out the words "or otherwise disposed of."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On page 76, line 5, I move to strike out the word "exchange" and insert the word "or," and to strike out "or other disposal."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. On line 8 I move to strike out the word "exchange" and insert the word "lease."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the fact that section 2 does provide for a report being submitted annually to Congress.

Mr. KING. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 76, after line 11, to insert:

CHAPTER III.

That the Boughton Memorial Association, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Kansas, be, and is hereby, authorized to erect and maintain a suitable building, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, in and upon the United States military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the plans of such building to be first approved, and to be constructed in such location as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the use of such portion of the ground floor of said building as may be necessary shall be given to the Post Office Department of the United States, free of charge, for the post-office service of the reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 77, to insert:

CHAPTER IV.

That sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of Chapter XV of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board: That there is hereby created a board to be known as the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury as ex officio members, and of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, or of representatives designated by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively. The duties of the board shall be: (1) To make rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter; (2) to select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under sections 5 and 6; (3) to recommend to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy such general measures as will promote correlation and efficiency in carrying out the purpose of this chapter by their respective departments; and (4) to direct the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 provided in section 7 of this chapter. The board shall meet at least quarterly, and shall elect annually one of its members as chairman, and shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to section 2, to come in at the end of section 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas offers an amendment to the amendment, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. At the end of section 2, on line 11, page 78, it is proposed to insert:

The allotment to the States and any funds under the control of said board not otherwise allotted by this chapter may respectively be expended by said States and said board for the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of lands for sites; for the construction, enlargement, repair, improvement, equipment, furnishing, stocking, maintenance, and operation thereon and on lands already owned by the United States, or by the States or others, of buildings, hospitals, quarantine stations, industrial farms, and schools for the purposes of this chapter: *Provided, however*, That for sufficient cause shown or upon failure to carry out the conditions prescribed therefor any allotment or appropriation of funds made under any section of this chapter may be revoked in whole or in part in the discretion of said board.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I reserve the point of order against the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas on the ground that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, before the Senator insists upon the point of order I desire to state that the whole matter is general legislation, and the point would apply to the whole chapter as well as it would to this.

Mr. KING. If it will, I shall raise the point of order against the entire provision.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not do that.

Mr. KIRBY. If the Senator will let me make an explanation of this amendment, I think that the chapter should not be withdrawn or objected to even if the amendment offered by me shall fail. Here is the condition which the amendment was offered to meet:

In the State of Arkansas a cantonment was established at Camp Pike. The citizens of the State gave 3,000 acres of land, and they gave rent free 10,000 acres of land to the Government to be used as maneuver grounds. A great camp was established down there, one of the largest in the country, and necessarily there congregated about that camp women of easy virtue. They overran the town. The condition was so bad that the State was hardly able to cope with it at all. Something had to be done to protect the citizens and to protect the soldiers under those conditions and to protect the women and to take care of them.

Under those circumstances the Interdepartmental Hygiene Board went to the State of Arkansas and said: "We will pay one-half of the amount of the cost of the construction of an industrial school, if the State will pay the remainder of that cost, to take care of this condition, to take care of these women, and relieve the town of the menace and relieve the soldiers of the menace." That was the condition, and the board agreed with our people to put up \$50,000 if the State would put up another \$50,000 for the construction and erection of this school. The State raised its \$50,000 for this particular purpose, and the board refused or was unable to perform its part of the agreement, because it was said that under the law there was not sufficient authority to contribute this money for the erection of a building.

That is the condition down there. The money has been raised for this purpose. It was raised under these conditions. The necessity existed for it, and I understand that in two other cantonments they made like promises of small amounts of money. Under those conditions it seemed to us that the Government ought to perform its part of the agreement, in order that the condition might be fully taken care of, the State paying at least one-half of it. On that account I have offered this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator having the bill in charge to a bill that the Appropriations Committee is considering appropriating money for this very purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This does not appropriate a cent.

Mr. SMOOT. I am saying what we are considering by way of an appropriation. The Senator says this does not appropriate a cent. It says, in section 5:

That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000 to carry out the provision of section 2 of this chapter.

Is not that an appropriation?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is merely a repetition of the language of the act as passed last year. It had to be recited, along with the rest of the section, because each of the six sections that are being amended contains language that has to be corrected, and it is merely a repetition of the former act. If the Senator desires, I can point out the changes in the language. It does not involve any increase whatsoever in the appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. I think perhaps it would have been better to simply state the amendments to the sections of the chapter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are quite a large number of them.

Mr. SMOOT. It may be that it would have taken just as many words to do that as it would to recite the whole law.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; that is the trouble.

Mr. SMOOT. I will ask the Senator, then, to point out briefly what changes are made.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Before I point them out, I desire to say this:

After this act was passed and this board organized—and you will notice in the first section that it is very largely an ex officio board—and attempted to do business under the appropriations given to it, the Auditor for the Treasury Department rendered an opinion which, in effect, made the whole act inoperative, and they have been unable to expend any of these funds; or, if so, they have been able to expend very little; so they desire a correction in the language in order that the intent of Congress shall be carried out. The thing has been tied up. For instance, on line 16, page 77, you will notice the words "to make rules." In the old act it read "to recommend rules," and there is some little technicality as between "recommend" and "make," so we put in the word "make" instead of the word "recommend." On line 19, after the word "under," we struck out the word "said" that used to be there. It used to read "under said sections," and now it reads "under sections." Then, on line 5, of page 78, the language as proposed now reads:

That the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board is—

It used to read:

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are—

That was a mistake in bill drafting. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are two of several ex officio members of the entire board. The result was that the rest of the members of the board were quite powerless, and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy apparently did not get together, and nothing happened. In other words, the majority of the board could not do business.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator a question. If the law is corrected as suggested by the Senator, will the appropriations that were made then be available for this purpose for the future?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They will.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I thought.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator will notice that on line 16, page 81, there is this new provision:

Any unexpended balances appropriated under this chapter are hereby reappropriated.

Now, "this chapter" means the law as passed last year.

Mr. SMOOT. In other words, Mr. President, for this particular purpose there is \$1,000,000, \$1,400,000, \$100,000, \$300,000, and \$300,000 reappropriated?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes. There is no new appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT. No new appropriation; but that money has either been expended or else it is to be expended.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Over a term of years, the Senator will notice.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly. I notice, Mr. President, that the departments of the Government now are not content with asking appropriations through one appropriation bill, but we find them in every appropriation bill. We have to-day under consideration in the Committee on Appropriations the sundry civil appropriation bill. Gen. Blue was before the committee to-day, asking for appropriations for this very work. He had a number of doctors with him, telling the committee why these appropriations should be made.

Mr. THOMAS. He is not in the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. No; but I say it is not only the War Department but it is the Navy and all. For the maintenance and expenses of the Division of Venereal Diseases established by sections 3 and 4, Chapter XV, of the act approved July 9, 1918, including personal and other services in the field and in the District of Columbia, they estimated for an expenditure for the coming year of \$1,085,840. The House decided that they would give \$200,000. They now claim that if given \$330,000 instead of the \$200,000 provided by the House they can get along another year.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to his colleague?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. KING. In addition to that amount, if I understand correctly, the department with which Gen. Blue is connected is asking for a very large appropriation for the Public Health Service.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; to prevent epidemics, in which are enumerated all sorts of diseases, the House gave them \$400,000; and in the deficiency bill, the last one that passed the last Congress, we appropriated \$1,000,000 for this very purpose.

Mr. KING. They have machinery already in existence, and have a number of appropriations for the services of those who are operating in this board and in boards that are connected with it aggregating hundreds of thousands of dollars if not millions of dollars.

Mr. SMOOT. Now, Mr. President, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] suggests, this is to be done in cooperation with the States, just the same as in the case of this other law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I ask the Senator if Dr. Blue or any of those who were with him went into detail as to the condition of the public health with respect to these particular diseases?

Mr. SMOOT. They told the committee what had already been done and what they had endeavored to do, and also the condition, so far as venereal diseases were concerned, as existing at the time of the breaking out of the war and as developed through investigations since the war began.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will permit me to say so, the developments in the way of evidence before the Military Affairs Committee were so shocking as to civil life

that it seemed to the committee that no amount of money could be ill spent that was appropriated for the eradication of these diseases. False modesty has prevented parents and civilians generally from talking to the young as plainly as they ought to about these diseases. A major general who returned from France the other day told me that in his division, which had been more or less afflicted with these diseases, when they came out of Germany for the purpose of demobilization or embarkation home, there were only three cases among 25,000 men. The proportion of men who went into the drafted Army from civil life who suffered from these diseases was simply astounding. The Senators who heard those witnesses will remember that. The result of this appropriation and others made along the same line has been practically to eradicate it from the Army, or to reduce it to a minimum, with a great tendency toward curing it in civil life; and it seems to me very much more important than the large appropriations of money for the cure of hog cholera. I think the human system is more entitled to have the money.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, where have they obtained the money to carry on the work that they seem to have accomplished already.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator that the States, realizing the importance of it, are participating in the expenditure of money. Take the city of Portland, for instance. Following along the line that this bill proposes to follow, they are appropriating large sums of money, and engaged in the work independently of the Government; but now the Government proposes to cooperate with the States and with municipalities for eradicating these diseases.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that there is \$3,200,000 included in these appropriations now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That is not too much.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator says that is not too much. That is not all that is appropriated. The general deficiency bill is yet to come, and I do not know how much that will carry; but I do know what the House has agreed to in the sundry civil appropriation bill, and of course I know that if we gave them \$20,000,000 they will spend it. There is no doubt about that. It will be all spent, and I doubt very much whether there will be any more good accomplished by the \$20,000,000 than there would have been by the \$1,500,000.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him just a little bit further, what is known as the venereal-disease carriers can not be taken care of unless there is active participation between the Federal Government and the States. The Senator knows that. The mere statement of the fact will enable the Senator to understand just what I mean. Under this bill as it was the Government has been powerless to cooperate fully with the States, because, as the Senator has said, of some decision of the auditor; and it does seem to me that we can not appropriate too much money for the eradication of these diseases. In my opinion, they are more dangerous to the life of the Republic than consumption itself.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, the question in my mind is this: Who can best administer this law? The appropriation is right. It ought to be appropriated. Shall it be done by Dr. Blue, in the Public Health Service, or shall it be done by the War Department? We do not want both departments doing the same kind of thing in cooperation with the States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. This is not the War Department.

Mr. SMOOT. This is not the War Department. This is an appropriation on an entirely outside subject in the Army appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Whether it is the War Department, or what it may be, one department ought to administer it. It ought not to be carried on by half a dozen departments, because, if that is done, there will be confusion. Dr. Blue is doing this work in cooperation with the States to-day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Gen. Blue is a member of this board.

Mr. SMOOT. This is an additional appropriation to the one they are asking the Appropriations Committee to make.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; that is not the substance nor the effect of this amendment. I can not agree with the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Is not the effect of this amendment to appropriate \$3,200,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will have this effect: It will reappropriate the unexpended balance of the appropriation which they were authorized to spend last year, and which they could not spend because the decision of the auditor or the comptroller tied them up; that is all.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator know how much there is of that unexpended balance?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not. There is no change in the total appropriation. I do think the point made by the Senator from Utah is a wise one, that when they come to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and ask for additional money that committee had better find out how much they have under their original law.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that we never know what is coming. I had no idea, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that this provision would be put into the military bill. It never ought to be there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the Senator on that. The reason why it happened to be presented to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate was that the original legislation came from the Military Affairs Committee as a rider on the military appropriation bill of July 9, 1918.

Mr. SMOOT. As a war measure?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As a war measure; yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think it is due the Appropriations Committee, and it also ought to be required of the department, that whenever they want the expenditure of a dollar for this purpose the request ought to come through the regular committee and in the regular way. The sundry civil appropriation bill is before the committee now, and not two hours ago Gen. Blue was before that committee asking for an increased appropriation over and above what the House has granted for this very purpose; and the general never said a word to the Appropriations Committee in relation to the pending legislation.

Mr. President, there is a very important committee meeting that I have to attend. The other members of the committee are waiting, and I shall have to leave the Chamber at this time; but I will say to the Senator from New York that I really believe this chapter ought to go out of this bill, and the whole subject matter ought to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, which has this very subject under consideration and will begin the marking up of the bill to-morrow morning.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I raise the point of order against the entire amendment. I shall insist upon the point of order. While I had some doubts, when I first suggested it, as to the propriety of the action, I am entirely confirmed in my view after having heard the explanation submitted by my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

I do not wish to interfere with any legitimate appropriation for the purposes indicated in the original act. The original act is still in existence. The Senator from New York states, as I understand him, that because of the ruling of one of the departmental officials the appropriation carried by that act was not made available. That being true, the money has not been appropriated. The entire subject is before the Appropriations Committee, and this agency that will expend the money will ask for additional appropriations for other departments of the Public Health Service. It will be far better to have one committee consider all of these questions, and the needs of the Public Health Service, and make appropriations so that there will be no overlapping.

I am confirmed in the view which I had when I raised the point of order, and I respectfully insist upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Utah that at this time the point of order is not in order, the pending amendment being the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY]. Does the Senator from Arkansas desire a vote on his amendment?

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to have my amendment voted on, and I should like very much to see it adopted. I think the justice of the condition requires that it shall be done.

I want to say to the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that rather than see this section of the bill defeated I will very gladly withdraw my amendment. If he expects, however, to insist upon the point of order against the entire section, I am of opinion that the point is well taken; but I should prefer to withdraw my own amendment if that will satisfy the Senator's objection.

Mr. KING. No; it will not satisfy it, because I shall raise the point of order against the entire amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. Then I shall ask for a vote upon my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the point of order should not be made upon the chapter as a whole. The point of order ought to be made upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Wisconsin that under the parliamentary status a point of order against the chapter is not now in order.

Mr. LENROOT. But I am making the point of order upon the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests it is not in order to make the point of order, the pending question being upon the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LENROOT. But I am making the point of order against the amendment now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Against the amendment itself?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And the chapter?

Mr. LENROOT. No; I do not make a point of order against that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not think the point of order lies against the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas as legislation upon an appropriation bill when it is an amendment to a provision which of itself is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. LENROOT. The Chair may be right about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the Chair overrules the point of order of the Senator from Wisconsin. The question is upon the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, anticipating that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is about to make a point of order against this legislation and strike it from the bill, I desire to present for the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to Hon. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN, under date of June 13, 1919, by Dr. T. A. Storey, the executive secretary of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board, which explains in detail the necessity for these verbal changes in the act which was passed by Congress last year.

If the Senator from Utah desires to take the responsibility, he may do it. I would not if I were he. If this legislation or something closely akin to it does not go through, this act remains inoperative, and the great and beneficent work which the Congress decreed should be done will not be done. It may be that the Senator from Utah will himself take the responsibility of bringing this matter to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations and get them to attach it to another appropriation bill. I hope he will, because if he or some other Senator does not do it, and I shall try to do it myself if it is stricken out of this bill, the whole legislation fails, because to get it through as a separate bill would be extremely difficult.

I want to have the situation known. This does not increase the expenditures of the Government one penny. It merely corrects obvious errors in the legislative language of an act passed a year ago. That is its only purpose. It is subject to a point of order because it is legislation upon an appropriation bill, but for the life of me I can not see what is accomplished by striking it out of the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have thought of all the admonitions which the distinguished Senator from New York has administered just now, and having them in mind and with a due appreciation of the importance, or lack of importance, of the action which I am about to take, I still insist upon the point of order. Let me say in conclusion it is not because of any opposition to the measure intrinsically, but this entire subject is receiving consideration at the hands of another committee. That committee will be compelled to legislate for other fields of activity equally as important into which the board which would administer this particular appropriation will be compelled to enter. Having the entire subject before it, it will deal with it in a proper and a rational way. I insist upon the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter submitted by the Senator from New York will be incorporated in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES INTERDEPARTMENTAL SOCIAL HYGIENE BOARD,
Washington, June 13, 1919.

HON. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
Chairman Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By direction of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board I am submitting to you herewith certain amendments to chapter 15 of the Army appropriation bill of July 9, 1918. (See chap. 15, Public, 193, 65th Cong., "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.")

Interpretations of the language of this chapter made by the Comptroller of the Treasury on October 8, October 25, and November 25, 1918, have disclosed inadvertencies that establish unsuspected legislative limitations and make it impossible for the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board to meet certain of its obligations under the act or to accomplish certain very important purposes for which this chapter was devised and for which its merits were argued before committee and for which it was approved by Congress.

These limitations and their proposed corrections may be concisely stated as follows:

I.

On September 24, 1918, the chairman of the board addressed the following questions to the Comptroller of the Treasury:

"1. Whether salaries of employees, necessary rentals, printing, travel expenses, and miscellaneous expenditures necessary for the functions of the board in carrying out the purposes of the act are proper charges against appropriation of \$100,000 made by section 7, chapter 15, Public 393, act of July 9, 1918."

On October 8, 1918, the Comptroller of the Treasury in his reply stated that—

"None of the appropriations is for the expenses of an organization of the board." (See communication of Oct. 8, 1918, p. 4, lines 1 and 2.)

Because of this decision the board finds unavailable for purposes of administrative organization the particular resource that was clearly intended by the framers of the act to enable the board to meet its administrative obligations and responsibilities under this act. The board finds, too, that there is no other appropriation under this act that is available for such purposes.

II.

On October 25, 1918, a communication from the Comptroller of the Treasury reads as follows:

"The duties of the board are prescribed by section 1 as—

"(1) To recommend rules and regulations for the expenditure of moneys allotted to the States under section 5 of this chapter.

"(2) To select the institutions and organizations and fix the allotments to each institution under said section 5.

"The terms of the appropriation under section 5 do not provide for allotments to States, institutions, and organizations. Such an appropriation is provided for by section 6 of this act, but the allotments to the States are to be in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and those to organizations, institutions, etc., under the board. The duties of the board and the appropriations are thus not properly designated in connection with the statutory provisions."

III.

The attention of the board has been called to the fact that five States have no legislative session this calendar year and can not therefore qualify for the appropriation carried by section 6 of chapter 15, to which the following condition is attached:

"* * * and such allotment to be so conditioned that for each dollar paid to any State the State shall specifically appropriate or otherwise set aside an equal amount for the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases * * *"

SUMMARY.

In brief, these proposed amendments would accomplish the following:

(1) They would release a fund already appropriated and render it available for the administrative expenses of the board and thus enable that board to meet its obligations and its responsibilities under this law.

(2) They would secure a proper designation of the duties of the board and clarify its responsibilities.

(3) They would remove a discrimination against those States that have no legislative session this calendar year.

(4) And they would reappropriate unexpended balances so that the budget of the board for the coming year would carry no new appropriations.

You will note that this letter is substantially a copy of the letter sent you under date of January 16 and signed personally by Mr. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy and chairman of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board; Mr. Carter Glass, Secretary of the Treasury; and Mr. Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War. You will remember that all of these gentlemen are members of the Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board.

Very sincerely, yours,

T. A. STOREY,

Executive Secretary Interdepartmental Social Hygiene Board.

Mr. OVERMAN. Of course, if the Senator from Utah insists upon his point of order, it will go out. The Appropriations Committee is considering this very question. Will not the Senator agree to let the whole matter be referred to the Committee on Appropriations which has the subject now under consideration?

Mr. KING. That would afford me very great pleasure, and it was my purpose to invite the attention of the Appropriations Committee to this measure if its attention had not already been invited to it, with a view of having the entire subject consolidated and all questions as to the board treated in one bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think it is a very important matter. This particular question is not before us. The appropriation for which Gen. Blue asks is, I think, only \$400,000.

Mr. KING. I shall see that it is called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. It seems to me that this is very wise legislation, and it ought to be considered by our committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the parliamentary status. The pending question is the point of order submitted by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. OVERMAN. I would suggest—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order unless the Senator from North Carolina wishes to submit some other suggestions upon it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Utah that it would probably be best to make a motion to refer the matter to the Committee on Appropriations rather than to raise the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah makes the point of order—

Mr. KING. If that can be done, but I do not think it can.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair can not entertain a motion to refer a part of the bill to another committee.

Mr. KING. I know of no procedure which would permit that to be done.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah? In view of the importance of this legislation, let the matter be submitted to the Senate, and if it is adopted the conferees will have a chance to amend the provision in any way they see fit, but if it goes out on a point of order it ends the whole business. I think in view of the importance of it the Senator ought to let it go to conference.

Mr. KING. I am not willing to have the amount of the appropriation contained in the bill to be carried. The appropriation for 1918 is not available now, and it seems to me the whole matter ought to be dealt with by the appropriate committee when it is considering other expenditures that are to be recommended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah makes the point of order that chapter 4 is legislation upon a general appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The next amendment was, on page 81, after line 22, to insert:

CHAPTER V.

International Aircraft Standards Commission: That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, upon the recommendation of a committee consisting of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce, delegates to the International Aircraft Standards Commission, at least two of whom shall be officers of the aeronautical technical or engineering staffs of the War Department and the Navy Department; to give official approval of the purposes, rules of procedure of said commission, and to publish its recommendations from time to time as he may deem advisable; and to appoint members of advisory committees of the commission and members of the National Aircraft Standards Committee upon the recommendation of the committee heretofore designated to recommend the appointment of delegates to the International Aircraft Standards Commission.

SEC. 2. That for the current fiscal year the actual and necessary expenses of delegates to the International Aircraft Standards Commission, or authorized agents on special duty, at home or abroad, for standardization purposes, including the sum of \$1,000 for the payment of the proportionate share of the United States in the maintenance of the central office of the International Aircraft Standards Commission, and not exceeding in the aggregate \$6,000, shall be paid from any other funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated upon certificates of the Secretary of War that the expenditures are necessary for the study of the development of aircraft production for military purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make a point of order against this proposed amendment, chapter 5, on the ground that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill. I think the matter ought to be considered on its merits.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has raised a point of order against this proposal and said that it should be considered on its own merits. That is exactly what has happened. It has been considered on its merits by the Committee on Military Affairs. I suppose the point of order will be held as well taken, and therefore the insistence upon it will result in the defeat of the proposition. For one I shall greatly regret it.

We are at the eve of a wonderful era in the development of aircraft and the science and art of flying. Other great nations of the earth, all of them our friends in the recent contest, have organized this international commission for the purpose of exchanging information, comparing notes, standardizing definitions and technical terms and minor or component parts of aeroplanes or engines. They have invited the United States to join them. Their Governments have in turn indorsed this proposal, and our delegates, if we are to have any, can not sit in this international body unless the Government of the United States by legislative expression authorizes it.

The delegates were invited several months ago, in the first instance, to attend the first meeting, which met in the city of London last October before the armistice. We had several technical engineers over there at that time, who derived a great deal of benefit in their knowledge of this great and new art by coming in contact with the people who were gathered from these other countries. They could not sit officially because they had no credentials. The next meeting was called for this spring. The Secretary of War named seven or nine delegates, I forget which, composed of automotive engineers, technical people, scientific people, who have taken a very deep interest in the development of aircraft and who want to come in contact with the progress in aircraft of other countries. The Secretary of War then noticed that in the by-laws, as it were, of this international organization each set of delegates should have credentials from their respective Governments. He therefore had to withdraw the invitation extended to the seven or nine eminent men in this country in order to come to Congress and get some act of the legislative branch to authorize it; and the proposal contained in the bill is to make it possible for the United States

to march abreast of the times in the development of aircraft by being permitted to be represented in this international congress.

The expense is next to nothing. We would contribute \$1,000 as our share of the expense toward keeping open the central offices, which for the time being are in London, and we would allow not to exceed \$6,000 for the expenses of the first delegation which we send. It does not pledge the Congresses of the future with respect to appropriations. That was, in fact, asked for by some of the people who wanted this kind of legislation, but your committee refused to attempt to make a continuing appropriation.

I sincerely hope the Senator from Tennessee will withdraw the point of order. It seems a pity that we in this great country, who are to-day so hopelessly behind by comparison with other countries in aircraft development, should be denied the right, as this legislation attempts to secure it, to sit with the representatives of England, France, Italy, and Canada, who have formed this international commission.

I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press the point of order.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, to what the chairman of the committee has said I should like to add that this meeting was originally called to take place three months ago, but was postponed until the 30th of June at the request of the United States in order that we might be represented at the convention.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I can add very little to what has been urged by the chairman in support of this desired legislation. The Senator who makes the point of order states that it is a subject which should receive independent consideration and stand or fall upon its merits. Of course, that is true of all items of legislation, but because one happens to appear in a general appropriation bill it does not follow that it has not been considered upon its merits.

The subcommittee which was appointed to consider the bill gave very careful attention to this item, and were impressed with the fact that independent of any other consideration immediate action was required in view of the nearness of the time when this conference is to be held. It is to meet six days from to-day, and if we are to have representation there at all it is impossible to take up and consider the subject either by way of a special bill or joint resolution. It must pass now or it will be ineffectual. The importance of the legislation seems to me to be obvious to any and every friend of aviation. The art is in some degree in its infancy. It certainly is in the active stages of development.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator says the art of aircraft is in its infancy, and I thoroughly agree with that statement. Does the Senator think that with an art of this kind in its infancy to authorize an international commission to standardize parts will be of any good effect? Will it not have the effect of preventing improvements rather than aiding in securing improvements?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think the meeting of such a commission to consider the subject of standardizing parts is at all inappropriate, because there are many parts which can now be standardized, particularly as regards the machine part of an airplane. But, Mr. President, the fact that it may be undesirable to standardize to any very great extent is not an argument against but an argument for our participation in the conference.

By meeting and the interchange of minds and of opinions, by comparison of the various items involved in the construction of aircraft, we can best determine—it is the only way in which we can determine—the question of standardization or of nonstandardization. But the interchange of ideas, of views, the opportunities afforded by the examination of the many devices and the many improvements that have been made or that are contemplated, some of which may be practical and some not so, all these things require participation by this Nation with the other countries engaged in this great work if we expect to continue to develop aircraft in America.

Of course if we are to stop, if we are to pursue the same course that we followed after the airplane was invented, if we are to sit supinely by and let other nations take our ideas and inventions and expand and develop and apply them to their own uses and needs without participation, we ought to know it. If that is to be the policy of this country, the amendment is useless. If, on the other hand, we are seriously minded and appreciate as we should the tremendous need of complete information upon the subject, then our participation in the meetings is not only highly desirable but absolutely essential. Confronted with such a condition, with only a few days in which to legislate, if we are to legislate at all, I regret far more poignantly than I

am able to express the interposition of the point of order. I think it is unfortunate. I think the Senator from Tennessee is, unintentionally, of course, and with the best of motives, putting a very serious obstacle in the way of our concurrent participation in the advancement of this great art.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, when this bill was before the Senate it was quite different from what it is now. As I recall it, though I have not the original bill before me, it gave our delegates authority to agree for the United States upon the standardization of airplane parts. To my mind a more dangerous measure could hardly be imagined at this time in the art of aircraft. As shown by my every vote since I have been in either House of Congress, I take it no one is more in favor of the development of aircraft than I have been and than I am now. I am for the largest appropriation; but I believe that this will smother the development of the art, and I want to state why.

Suppose this commission goes over to England. They will hold a meeting in London in a few days. Suppose it agrees for the United States, for instance, that we will take the Liberty engine and standardize it. Let it take any particular part, for instance. If you standardize that part, what effect will it have? Those engaged in manufacturing the standardized parts will fare exceedingly well at the hands of the commission. Those not engaged, those who do not manufacture the standardized parts, will have a very difficult time disposing of their manufactured product. I think it ought to be absolutely free; I do not think there ought to be any governmental control or attempted control of the manufacture of these parts. We need every improvement in aircraft that we can get. We want no thwarting of inventive genius. What we need is to give every man who has any idea, whether it is indorsed by this standardization commission or not, an opportunity to present that idea to the Government or to the people of any country and have it adopted if it is better than the standardized idea.

The standardization of parts—and that, as I understand, is the purpose of the legislation—is sought. The purpose of the legislation is to form an international committee for the standardization of parts of airplanes. I think it would have a decidedly serious effect. Believing that, I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I have talked with some of the best engineers and scientists in the country, fliers of the Army, and others, and the only person who regards this provision as dangerous is the Senator from Tennessee. I do not know where he gets the idea. Everybody who takes an interest in the air game, so called, is exceedingly anxious for us to have our delegation in London, with the others. They do not seem to be very afraid of contact with them.

There is nothing whatsoever in the proposal which would compel the manufacturers to adopt the same standard of manufacture. The principal object of a constructive character is to come to a standardization of the definitions of terms, and the standardization of the method of making tests of strength—tensile strength, such as the dimensions in the forms of tensile test bars—and all the scientific things which are mostly Greek to me but in which scientists take tremendous interest. They want to have a standardization of terms and the methods of making tests, so that if a machine is tested in England under a certain system of testing for strength or speed the American manufacturer will know what that means. The English system of testing will then be understood by our people. Then there are the other tests—the heated treatment for ultimate strength, for elongation, and for yielding points. I do not know what all the terms mean, but these people are exceedingly anxious that they shall be standardized.

There is no bugaboo in this thing. The Senator from Tennessee can see in it a great horrid danger that will choke off aircraft development in the United States. Every aircraft man that I have seen or talked to wants this commission. The responsibility is with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, the position of the Senator from Tennessee is that it will not be a good thing for the United States. He does not believe in the standardization internationally of aircraft parts and equipment. I believe we have more to receive from England and France, who have made a study of this art and whose development of it has gone further than ours, than we have to give them.

The argument has been made here by the Senator, and he has made a point of order. Let us vote on it. Let us leave it to the Senate to decide. Do not take that advantage, in view of the argument that has been made, but let us vote as to whether the Senate wishes this legislation or not. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he will not withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MCKELLAR. If I had thought it was unimportant, I never would have made it. I never have made a point of order

unless I believed it to be important. I think this is important. I do not agree with the Senator at all, and, feeling that way, I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee makes the point of order that the pending provision is legislation upon a general appropriation bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 2, to insert:

CHAPTER VI.

Transfer of ammunition: That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to turn over on request from other executive departments of the Government, in his discretion, from time to time, without charge therefor, such ammunition, explosives, and other ammunition components as may prove to be or shall become surplus or unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department and as shall be suitable for use in the proper activities of other executive departments.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 12, to insert:

Col. William A. Simpson: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 18, to insert:

Maj. H. W. Daley: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, Maj. H. W. Daley, National Army, to the position and rank of major on the retired list.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if these promotions were recommended by the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Some are, and upon two or three of them the War Department has not been heard from. Members of the committee felt that they had sufficient information of their own to justify the insertion of these items. The matter of Col. Simpson was passed on by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs at least on two occasions, and the Senate has passed a separate bill at least once, and I think twice, of exactly this character. The Secretary of War has certainly indicated his approval of the promotion of Col. Simpson on the retired list.

In the case of Capt. Hand, at the bottom of page 83, I received a letter from the Secretary of War urging this treatment of Capt. Hand, who, incidentally, now is a major, and who, if this legislation is adopted, will become a lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army on the active list. The case of Maj. Daley was brought to my attention by Maj. Gen. Hugh Scott. This man Daley has been a packer in the Regular Army for 50 years. Gen. Scott writes me that he has served all the way from the British border down to Mexico. He served under Gen. Crook as chief packer with a mule train. He served in the Cuban campaign and in the Philippines, and, although at an advanced age, the War Department commissioned him as a major in the emergency army a year and a half ago to teach this new army how to throw the diamond hitch. He served his Government and country for 50 years, but never as a commissioned officer in the Regular Army. This is to put him on the retired list of the Regular Army with the grade of major. He is a picturesque, splendid old character, who is probably the world's greatest authority on packing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 23, to insert:

Capt. Daniel W. Hand: That the name of Daniel W. Hand, now captain of Field Artillery, be placed on the lineal list of officers of Field Artillery in the position he would have occupied if he had not suffered the loss of rank announced in General Orders, No. 156, War Department, August 8, 1910; and the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Capt. Hand, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the grade which such restored position on the lineal list requires, to be an additional number in the grade until absorbed and no longer.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 9, to insert:

Capt. Frank Barber: That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Barber, a first lieutenant of the Dorset Regiment of Infantry of the British Army, who lost the sight of both eyes and became totally blind by reason of a premature explosion on February 14, 1918, while acting as an instructor of United States troops at Camp Wheeler, Ga., as compensation for disability resulting therefrom, such sums of money as by the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1917, is provided to be paid as compensation for disability to an injured person who has lost both eyes or become totally blind from causes occurring in the line of duty in the service of the United States; and such compensation shall be payable and be paid as of and from the 14th day of February, 1918, and under and according to the terms, conditions, and basis of computation in said act provided, and such sum shall be in full of all claims, legal or equitable, of the said Frank Barber, his heirs, representatives, or assigns.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move, in line 10, page 84, that the word "Captain" be stricken out and the word "Lieutenant" inserted. The officer is a lieutenant.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 7, to insert:

Capt. Leonard F. Matlack: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Capt. Leonard F. Matlack, now serving with the Eighth Cavalry, to the position and rank of captain on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 85, after line 13, to insert:

Credit in the accounts of Col. Jesse McI. Carter: The accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to allow and credit in the accounts of Col. Jesse McI. Carter, Cavalry, United States Army, the sum of \$352.23, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on page 85, line 14, I move that the word "colonel" be stricken out and the words "major general" inserted, so as to read: "Maj. Gen. Jesse McI. Carter."

Mr. President, this is a very just claim, which has been withheld from Gen. Carter for several years. The circumstances are so peculiarly inequitable and undeserved that I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD a memorandum of the facts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave to do so will be granted.

The memorandum referred to is as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1918.

Memorandum with respect to H. R. 9044.

In 1912 I was ordered to proceed to Europe as member of a board of officers for the purpose of studying the organization, training, and equipment of the cavalry of various States in Europe, and was appointed disbursing officer and quartermaster for the board, which was composed of myself and three other officers.

Before leaving I was supplied with \$1,000 from the fund "Contingencies of the Army, 1913," which fund, in the language of the appropriation act, was "to be expended under the immediate orders of the Secretary of War," "for all contingent expenses of the Army not otherwise provided for, and embracing all branches of the military service." I was instructed by the Secretary of War to expend this fund for the procurement of information, in payment for passports and viséing same, in tips to orderlies and horse holders, and in payment for entertainment of foreign officers in return for like courtesies extended by them. I limited expenditures of this sum to the items above named. I found that it was usual and customary and was expected that when orderlies and horse holders were detailed to attend the board at maneuvers or exercises a monetary remuneration should be made to the men so detailed. I ascertained in each case what the customary fee was and paid that and no more. I paid the State Department of the United States for passports for members of the board, and when it was necessary had these passports viséed in Europe and paid the authorized fee therefor. We were entertained as guests of foreign officers a number of times and returned such entertainment at our own expense. On one occasion we entertained several officers of the French Army at dinner in return for a like courtesy on their part, and I paid from the contingency fund the cost of the dinner for the French officers, not including the cost of the dinner for members of the board. To the best of my recollection, this amounted to approximately \$21.

The board was in Europe more than three months and visited Russia, Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and England and made an exhaustive study of the subject which it was ordered to study, and on its return submitted a report, accompanied by a system of drill regulations, which has revolutionized the training of cavalry in the United States.

I expended but \$352.23 of the \$1,000 "Contingencies of the Army" allotted to the board, and turned in the remainder to the United States Treasury. The note accompanying the estimate of the Quartermaster General, which states that the disallowance arose as a result of expenditure for transportation of excess baggage of officers, cab and carriage hire, tips, and gratuities to hotel servants, etc., is in error, as an examination of my accounts in the office of the Auditor for the War Department will show. No part of the funds allotted to me from "Contingencies of the Army" were expended for any of these purposes. No reimbursement to the members of the board for "tips and gratuities to hotel servants" was asked for and none was made.

I expended the amount (\$352.23) in the manner directed and for the procurement of information of value to the Government, and for which the board had been sent to Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 85, after line 19, to insert:

Capt. J. C. Garrett: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, J. C. Garrett, formerly a captain of Cavalry, to take rank as if he had remained continuously in the service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 86, to insert:

Col. Samuel R. Jones: That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, Col. Samuel R. Jones, United States Army, retired, to the position and rank of brigadier general on the retired list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, after line 6, to insert:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary foodstuffs now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the peoples of countries involved in the late war. The Secretary of War shall prescribe regulations and conditions for the selection and delivery of said supplies and foodstuffs to the American Red Cross for the purposes aforesaid.

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. ASHURST, and Mr. LENROOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee first addressed the Chair, and he is therefore recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice the language of the amendment reads:

But which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces, to be used by said American Red Cross as it shall determine to relieve and supply the pressing needs of the peoples of countries involved in the late war.

Is it the purpose to furnish the people of Germany, Austria, and Turkey with these supplies?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The purpose, Mr. President, which I gathered from a long conversation with the director of the American Red Cross, Dr. Livingston Farrand, was to distribute these supplies in Roumania, Czechoslovakia, Jugo-Slavia, old Serbia, Greece, and Poland.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think this distribution ought to be confined at best, if it is to go in this bill at all, to those who were allied with us in the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is pretty difficult to distinguish between friend and foe, ally or opponent, when you get into Czechoslovakia, into Austria, or into Hungary, as the races are so intermingled there and the nationalities so mixed up. Some of them bitterly hated the Austrian Government and some were devoted to it. It is going to be pretty difficult to say that the man who supported the Austrian Government in the late war should not have bandages or absorbent cotton given to him by anybody against whom he fought, and that the man next door, who is against the Austrian Government, may have bandages and absorbent cotton.

This proposal arose from this state of affairs, which may interest the Senate: The American Expeditionary Force is supposed to have on hand a surplus not needed by the Army in France or in occupied Germany, a large quantity of medical supplies and supplementary foodstuffs. By that I mean condensed milk, cocoa, dietary food, such as are used in hospitals and are given to convalescents, outside of the Army ration, so called. It is estimated that something under \$100,000,000 worth of these supplies are on hand in the Medical Corps in France. The statement is made that they could not be sold for much more than 10 cents on the dollar. The further statement is made that the British Government and the French Government are seriously considering, in fact they are offering to hand over to their respective Red Cross societies, their surplus of hospital supplies which have been accumulated by their armies in France. This suggestion is that we do the same thing.

There can be no question about the statement, I believe, that what is most needed in Central and Eastern Europe are medical supplies and dietary food. The representatives of the American Red Cross, who have traveled all through those countries during the negotiations now going on at Paris, report that those people are stripped absolutely bare of drugs, stripped absolutely bare of medicines and surgical supplies of one kind or another; that if a little child falls sick, or even if an adult falls sick, there is no proper diet, there is no food in all of those countries to feed him; and this method appealed to the committee as a good disposition to be made of the surplus supplies now held by our medical department in France which are not needed by our Army, especially in view of the fact that to bring them back here and to attempt to sell them would probably cost as much as we should get out of them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would the Senator accept an amendment in line 9, page 86, so that it would read: "and supplementary or dietary foods"; and after the word "now," where it first occurs in line 10, to insert "in the Medical Corps of the Army," instead of "in Europe"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The second amendment to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee is quite unnecessary, even from his own point of view, for the language now reads:

Such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary foodstuffs now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces.

Mr. McKELLAR. The purpose of my suggestion is this: I can see the very great force in the Senator's argument that surgical supplies and dietary foodstuffs such as he has mentioned might be given to these needy people; that is a humane proposition, and I think probably we should agree to that; but I do not know that we ought to go so far as to supply them to our enemies, though I think we might do that. I do not think, however, we ought to give the Secretary of War the right, by means of the Red Cross, to furnish foodstuffs generally.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I accept the amendment of the Senator substituting the word "dietary" for the word "supplementary," if that is what the Senator desires.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the words "supplementary foodstuffs" were represented to the committee as the term used to comprise the class of nutritive foods needed in hospitals and for convalescents. The word "dietary" might be too broad and include the needed supplementary foodstuffs; I think it would be better to retain the word which in common parlance and in the medical world is used to comprise that sort of foodstuffs as distinguished from ordinary foodstuffs. All foodstuffs in a sense are dietary, but those which accompanied the American Expeditionary Forces as supplementary foodstuffs are technically designed for hospitals and for convalescents. Instead of improving the phraseology, I think the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will have, rather, a tendency in the other direction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator if he does not think this will arrange it—we all have one purpose; we do not want to feed those people through the Red Cross—

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator's purpose is obvious and desirable, but I am afraid that his phraseology will defeat his purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator will not this phraseology do: Leave out the word "foodstuffs" and insert the words "not suitable for general consumption"?

Mr. THOMAS. I myself have no objection to that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should think that would cover it.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, Mr. President, a word as to the amendment of the committee. One of the inevitable scourges of war, especially among a people whose food supplies have been denuded, is typhus. Plague follows war in defeated countries under usual post-war conditions. Cholera has appeared in a number of the countries that were engaged in this war, principally in the Balkans. Some say it is a precursor of typhus, and typhus is one of the most contagious and deadly of all human afflictions. Unless it is restrained and restricted, it wipes populations from the earth; it obliterates them. There is nothing that can stay the blight of typhus except nutritive foods containing starch, such as potatoes and kindred vegetables, except medical supplies, which are equally desirable.

The representatives of the Red Cross represented to the committee a most terrible and deplorable prevalent condition in many of the countries in eastern and southeastern Europe which had been engaged in this unfortunate war. Unless they can be rescued from the overhanging threat of national obliteration, they must depend upon the Red Cross, and the Red Cross in turn must depend upon those who support it for the needful things which are essential to combat and to destroy this dread disease.

The absence of foodstuffs, the inability of the people to obtain requisite nutrition are also fruitful sources of disease of all kinds, and especially among little children, whose needs are peculiarly appealing to all, as they are perhaps more insistent than those of any other class of the population. They are in the growing stage; they are progressing from childhood and infancy into maturity, and the nutrition which their bodily requirements demand and insist upon can only be satisfied by a good, healthy nutritive food. Mr. Hoover is now attending to that part of the problem. He certainly should be, in view of the appropriation which was made some time ago.

Mr. KING. I was just about to ask the Senator, Mr. President, whether there was any evidence as to what had been done with the appropriation of \$100,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS. The Red Cross representatives, of course, had no information as to that, or, if they did, they did not disclose it to us. Their purpose was to secure a supply of medicines, surgical instruments and supplies, and nutritive foods designed for the Army in France, but no longer necessary, and which could not be disposed of for anything like cost to the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield, would not the foodstuffs referred to come under the head of "medical and surgical supplies"?

Mr. THOMAS. No; they do not. In a sense they are medical supplies, of course, but, if I may use a common expression, they are known to the trade as "supplementary foodstuffs." It is under that head that hospital supplies of that kind are purchased and secured. The phraseology of the section is designed

to meet existing conditions and to define what was intended as well as possible by the use of appropriate language.

Mr. KING. Do the words "supplementary foodstuffs" have a definite meaning?

Mr. THOMAS. "Supplementary foodstuffs" have a technical meaning in connection with our supplies in France, as I am informed.

I perhaps, Mr. President, can appreciate the importance, the supreme importance, of the need of medical supplies in a condition like this. The last year of the Civil War in the South was one affording in some degree parallel conditions. I was there at that time and came in daily contact as a boy with the terrible consequences of the absence of an adequate medical supply. We had no anesthetics; all amputations had to be made without them. We had no bandages except cotton, and they were serviceable hardly half the time. We had no antiseptics of any sort; in fact, except for here and there a fugitive supply of quinine, and salable all the way from \$250 to \$300 in gold per ounce, we had practically nothing to meet the ravages of an indigenous disease, the ague. I remember vividly and poignantly the supreme endurance and the awful suffering of our own people, exposed in some degree to these conditions, and I confess that I sympathize deeply with countries—my heart even goes out to enemy countries—whose people are confronted, as some of them now must be, with these awful conditions. Under the circumstances, I deem it our overpowering duty to permit the Red Cross to obtain such of these supplies as are necessary to meet these terrible conditions and overcome them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to amend in line 7, on page 86, by striking out the words "and directed"; in line 9, after the word "supplementary," by inserting the words "and dietary"; and before the word "now," at the beginning of line 10, by inserting the words "used in the treatment of the sick and injured." I ask the Secretary to read the provision as it will appear if thus amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. If amended as suggested by Mr. McKELLAR, the paragraph will read as follows:

The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross such medical and surgical supplies and supplementary and dietary foodstuffs used in the treatment of the sick and injured now in Europe and designed for but which are not now essential to the needs of the American Expeditionary Forces—

And so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSES. I offer an amendment, which I hope will be accepted by the Senator in charge of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it an amendment to the pending committee amendment?

Mr. MOSES. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 86, line 11, after the word "Forces," it is proposed to insert "or available for use in military hospitals in the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, will the Secretary read that amendment in conjunction with the words reported by the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. After the words "American Expeditionary Forces," it is proposed to insert the words "or available for use in military hospitals in the United States."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, it is doubtful what the term "available" would mean in this particular instance. How anything in France could be regarded as being "available" I do not know, although, of course, in one sense everything is available.

Mr. MOSES. Then I ask permission to change the amendment by striking out the word "available" and inserting "needed."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire as modified to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will now state the first committee amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over is on page 17.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as we are now going back to take up the amendments that we left uncompleted yesterday and last night, and as the consideration of this bill began with the discussion of the proposed committee amendment, on line 16, page 2, against which a point of order was raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I desire now, in accordance with the notice which I gave yesterday, to move to suspend the rules in order that that amendment may be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York to suspend the rules in order that he may present the amendment referred to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays will have to be called, as a two-thirds vote is required. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). May I inquire if the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. KNOX. I withhold my vote, having a pair with that Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I inquire if the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with that Senator to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDING. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], but on this question I am at liberty to vote. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. TRAMMELL (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. NEW. I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] on official business.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. LODGE. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE];

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS].

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

YEAS—44.

Ashurst	Harris	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Beckham	Harrison	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Henderson	New	Smith, S. C.
Elkins	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Spencer
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sterling
Fletcher	Kellogg	Page	Sutherland
Frelinghuysen	Kendrick	Ransdell	Thomas
Gay	Keyes	Reed	Wadsworth
Gerry	Kirby	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Hale	Lodge	Sheppard	Warren
Harding	McCormick	Simmons	Watson

NAYS—17.

Capper	La Follette	Nugent	Williams
Dial	Lenroot	Shields	Wolcott
France	McKellar	Swanson	
Kenyon	Nelson	Trammell	
King	Norris	Walsh, Mont.	

NOT VOTING—35.

Ball	Dillingham	McCumber	Poindexter
Bankhead	Edge	McLean	Pomerene
Borah	Fernald	Martin	Sherman
Brandagee	Gore	Myers	Smith, Md.
Caldor	Gronna	Owen	Smoot
Colt	Hitchcock	Penrose	Stanley
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	Phelan	Townsend
Cummins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phipps	Underwood
Curtis	Knox	Pittman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the question of suspending the rules the yeas are 44 and the nays are 17. So the rule is suspended to enable the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to introduce the amendment which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, after the numerals "\$1,000,000" at the end of line 15, on page 2, the following:

Provided, That the restrictions concerning personal services and the amount allowable for per diem allowance shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I move to amend by striking out, in lines 16 and 17, the words "personal services and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the proposed amendment it is proposed to strike out the words "personal services and."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, if this amendment should be adopted it would permit allowing a greater per diem than is now permitted under the general law, but all restrictions as to personal services would still remain.

In the discussion that was had of this proviso yesterday it was assumed that the only restriction in the law that would affect personal services was that of salary, but I am not at all sure but that if this language "personal services" remains in the proviso it will repeal many other provisions of law relating to personal services. One of them familiar to us all is that no one representing the Government shall have a personal interest in a contract that he makes with himself as agent of the Government. Here we have over \$2,000,000,000 worth of property to be sold by this sales organization, and we can not be too careful in this, which, as the chairman of the committee said yesterday, is the greatest sales campaign ever conducted in America. We can not afford to repeal any law safeguarding the interests of the Government with relation to personal services upon the part of any of the men who shall form a part of this sales organization.

If the Senate desires to do that—if the Senate desires to take its chances and say that any laws that we have prohibiting a man as agent of the Government from making a contract with himself as an individual shall be set aside, well and good, but before the Senate adopts this amendment it ought to realize that that may at least be the effect unless the amendment that I have proposed is adopted.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I should be as strenuously opposed as the Senator from Wisconsin to the repeal of any portion of the statutes which forbids the practices referred to by him. I regret that my knowledge of law and the statutes is not more complete, but I venture to call the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators to this language on page 2, commencing on line 4: "for all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, including the employment of translators and exclusive of all other personal services in the War Department."

My understanding is that under that language the only people that the War Department can employ and pay salaries to are translators, and that all other personal services are excluded from the salary-drawing class. It says, very distinctly, "and exclusive of all other personal services." Now, the phrase "personal services" used in the proviso on line 16 is but a repetition of the phrase "personal services" used on line 6, and refers to the same thing. I was wondering, therefore, if we would not accomplish the very thing the Senator from Wisconsin desires if we should retain the words "personal services" in the proviso and insert immediately thereafter the words "hereinbefore referred to," which would surely tie it close to the language on line 6, because, as the contingencies item is drafted from line 2 to line 15, no man except a translator can get a salary under the contingencies item in the meeting of any emergency. Now, it is going to be absolutely essential to pay some kind of salaries, and I believe pretty generous salaries, to the men who are going to sell these goods; and those words "personal services" in the proviso, in my humble judgment, refer back to the words "personal services" in line

6. I do not believe that will repeal the law to which the Senator refers. If it does, I shall never, of course, stand for it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator a question. I had supposed, and certainly understood yesterday, that the very purpose and necessity which the chairman stated existed for suspending the rules in order to secure this proviso was that this sales organization could not go on unless we had the proviso, because of the limitations of the law with reference to salaries.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, Mr. President, this is the first time it has ever been attempted to cover this Director of Sales' office under the term "Contingencies of the Army."

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; but they are personal services in the War Department.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but they are being paid to-day, as I understand, from emergency appropriations which would authorize the payment of emergency salaries. That authority expires July 1.

Mr. LENROOT. But if their services are not included in the language in lines 5 and 6, to which the Senator has now referred, how are they benefited by this proviso?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Because they are exempted from this language of the "Contingencies of the Army" item by this very proviso. That is the purpose of the proviso. It is to exempt them from that exclusion from the salary-drawing group. Today the only salary-drawing people under "Contingencies of the Army" are the translators. Now, I want to make this thing just as safe as the Senator from Wisconsin does.

Mr. LENROOT. I beg the Senator's pardon, but I can not at all agree with him in his construction of the proviso, that it would let in some one with reference to the personal service itself that the original language would exclude. That can not be so. All the proviso would mean would be that as to those who are within the text, other restrictions of law should not apply to them.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the only persons within the text are those carrying out existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

Mr. LENROOT. If that is true, then this proviso does not at all accomplish what the chairman expected it would accomplish.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not agree with the Senator. It specifically exempts from that exclusion the men who are to sell these goods.

Mr. LENROOT. No.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It says:

That the restrictions concerning personal services—

And the restrictions are recited on lines 5 and 6 above—
and the amount allowable for per diem allowance—

And that is recited on lines 12 and 13—

shall not apply to so much of the funds herein appropriated as may be required to carry out the purpose of existing laws relating to the sale of war supplies.

It exempts the war-supply administrators from the exclusions and restrictions of the language above.

Mr. LENROOT. What does the Senator suggest?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suggest that we retain the words "personal services," but insert immediately thereafter "hereinabove referred to," so that it will tie it securely to the phrase "personal services."

Mr. LENROOT. If the Senator will insert that after the word "restrictions," so as to read "that the restrictions hereinabove referred to," it would mean the same thing.

Mr. WADSWORTH. "Hereinabove recited."

Mr. LENROOT. "Hereinabove recited." I am willing, then, to withdraw my amendment, and move in lieu of it, in line 16, after the word "restrictions," to insert "hereinabove recited."

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment as modified.

The SECRETARY. In the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, after the word "restrictions," it is proposed to insert the words "hereinabove recited."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. After the word "supplies," I move to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and these words:

Provided further, That not more than one salary exceeding \$5,000 per year shall be paid out of the foregoing appropriation, and that one salary shall not exceed the sum of \$15,000 per year.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my instinct is against the amendment. I know there is a prejudice against large salaries, and I can understand that it may have some support; but I feel very deeply that you can not get this job done unless you trust

somebody to do it, and trust the War Department—we have got to trust them anyway—to pay the salaries that will get the service. That is the whole question.

I shall not demand the yeas and nays on the amendment. I ask for a rising vote, Mr. President.

Mr. FRANCE. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "supplies," in the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of \$12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department, or to any officer of the Army below the rank of major-general.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss this amendment at length. It is offered for the purpose of preventing the payment of excessive salaries in the War Department. It is rumored that one employee of the War Department is now receiving a salary of \$25,000 a year. I consider that salary to be wholly unreasonable. When we consider that the general in charge of all our forces is receiving altogether, including commutation of quarters, only \$13,000 a year and a trifle over—\$13,235—that a lieutenant-general receives only \$11,960, that a major-general receives only \$10,652, and that a brigadier-general receives only \$8,271, it seems to me clearly unnecessary to pay any employees of the War Department a salary of \$25,000. It seems to me that for a salary of \$12,000 it should be possible to find in the Republic some man who would be willing to serve the Government ably, efficiently, and unselfishly in this most important capacity.

I hope the Senate will grant my request for a roll call upon this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays upon it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken let me suggest that the latter part of the amendment is unnecessary. An officer of the United States Army, no matter to what duty he is assigned, has a fixed salary; and, as a consequence, his salary could not be increased or diminished were he assigned to the work of disposing of these supplies. It is fixed, and depend not upon the nature of his services but upon his rank.

Mr. FRANCE. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that. I am aware of that fact. However, if the language is not necessary, I do not think it weakens the amendment at all. If the Senator desires to offer an amendment to the amendment—

Mr. THOMAS. The effect of it might be, if adopted, to permit the appointment of a major-general at \$12,000, which would be very much more pay than he gets under the law.

Mr. FRANCE. It does not impress me that the amendment as drawn would have that effect. The purpose of the amendment is very clear, and I think its effect, if it should be adopted, would be very definite.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by striking out the following words at the end:

or to any officer of the Army below the rank of major-general—

So the amendment will read:

Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated or made available under this act shall be used for the payment of any salary in excess of \$12,000 per annum to any civilian employee in the War Department.

Mr. FRANCE. I accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposer of the amendment accepts it. The question is on the amendment to the amendment as modified.

Mr. FRANCE. I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to say a word, and but a word, on this amendment.

I do not want to appear in antagonism to the wishes of the chairman of the committee; but it does seem to me that Congress ought to retain some control over the amount of money that is to be paid these men who shall sell the materials that are on hand. I have not any knowledge of anything in relation to this business that leads me to the conclusion that it is necessary to have any superhuman talent employed.

I voted to suspend the rules because I thought \$4 a day was a ridiculously low limitation; but I am not in favor of taking off the limitation entirely; and it seems to me that \$12,000 a year—a salary that is almost twice as great as that paid to a Senator or a Congressman—ought to get us the kind of talent that will

know how to dispose of these goods. This service is not like that required in organizing some great business, building some great railroad, or laying out a plan which involves the establishment of a great series of banks. It is simply a question of disposing of these goods. We ought to have good men to do it. You can get plenty of good men in the United States for \$12,000 a year. I think some limitation ought to be imposed, and I am led to insist upon this, because at some hearings we have had in the past it has been developed that one man, at least, got \$25,000 a year. Candidly and frankly, speaking of him with all the kindness in the world, I do not think he was worth \$25,000 a century.

I do not want to create sinecures and fat jobs. Nobody else wants to do it. At the same time, I do not believe in a niggardly policy that puts the stipend down so low that men of good talents can not afford to take it. But \$1,000 a month, \$12,000 per annum, will get us as good men as we need. I do not think the best salesmen in the United States get much more than that.

I do not think it ought to be insisted that we should have excessive salaries paid here. If I had had any idea that any such request would be made, for one I would not have voted to set aside the rules.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, possibly the Senator from Missouri is right that \$25,000 a year is too much to pay in salary to any man administering an organization of this kind; but I want the Senator to understand the situation.

Mr. Hare was requested by Mr. Crowell, the Assistant Secretary of War, to become the head of the sales organization. When the armistice was signed the question of the sale of the great mass of material that was in the possession of the Government was an important problem. Mr. Hare had formed an organization through camp activities, and Mr. Crowell asked him to head this organization. He wanted to go home. He lives in another section of the country. He has a family. He can go back to private life and earn more than Mr. Crowell offered him, but Mr. Crowell asked him to stay and offered him \$25,000 a year. He had formed a sales organization for this material, which is scattered all over the country, in every locality where it was located; and in order to get business men to make the sales of this material he had to pay more than the limit. That is one of the reasons for this amendment. He wants to pay \$4,000 and \$5,000 for some of these men who are in the sales organization.

Mr. Hare has charge of \$2,500,000,000 worth of property belonging to the Government. It consists of ordnance supplies; it consists of the raw materials, such as wool, copper, and so on. He sold all his copper. He sold his copper at the market price at the time—not what the Government paid, but at the market price of 16 cents. He sold a large portion of the wool in his possession, and he told me to-day that he had saved \$5,000,000 over the amount the Army had fixed for the sale of certain of this material in the advance sales at the advance prices that had been procured through his sales agency. The organization is completed. This man has been selected by the Secretary of War. I do not know whether it is good policy to let him go now and employ another man at \$12,000. It seems to me it is good business to keep him there after he has developed this organization. It may be poor policy to pay any man \$25,000 a year, but if you disrupt that organization now, with the large amount of materials and supplies that are apt to deteriorate, food supplies, it seems to me that you are going to lose more than if you paid \$25,000 and let him continue in control.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. REED. The Senator states that this gentleman sold the copper at the market price. Does he really regard that as a phenomenal performance?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. No; I do not.

Mr. REED. And he sold the wool at the market price.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I consider that a very good transaction.

Mr. REED. Wool and copper are about as staple as gold or silver to-day, and if they have a market price I think almost anybody could sell them at the market price. When I was a country boy 12 years old I used to drive a load of corn to town and I always got the market price. They never offered me anything else.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not acquainted with Mr. Hare. I never spoke to him in my life. I never saw him except on the occasion of the consideration of this bill by the subcommittee. He impressed me as an unusually capable business man. I do not believe in extraordinary salaries nor in high prices where they can be avoided. I have tried to establish some element of frugality and economy in legislation in this

body, my efforts, however, up to this time being in inverse proportion to my success.

This is not, however, an ordinary situation. The cost price of the surplus material which the Government owns and which accumulated before the end of the war does not convey a very intelligible idea of the magnitude of the surplus nor of the problems which are involved in disposing of it. It is one which, in my judgment, will tax the highest capacity of the best business man in the world. I wish some one or more of our very prominent business men who have made phenomenal success in their own lines would volunteer their services to the Government and take this job and dispose of it. I can conceive of no higher test of the patriotism of a man of influence and ability than that. But I am not at all hopeful that any such action will occur.

Some of the things which this organization must do and which the head of the organization must require readily occur to any thinking man upon a few moments' reflection. These goods are valued not by the hundred thousand, nor by the million, nor by the tens of millions, nor by the hundreds of millions. They are valued by the billion, and they comprise almost every known item of merchandise. For the effectual prosecution of the war the Government entered every market it could reach, and became the sole customer, regardless of price, for every material entering into the industries of man, and upon the assumption that the war would last indefinitely. Had it not done so, it would have failed in its duty to the United States, to the people, and to our Allies. The abrupt termination of the war left the Government precisely in the situation of a great merchant suddenly confronted with a catastrophe, destroying all demand for his enormous stock of merchandise, with the difference that the Government can recoup its losses through taxation, while the merchant is helpless and bankrupt.

Now, Mr. President, these goods must not only be disposed of but they must be disposed of in an orderly, systematic, and scientific way; otherwise markets will be very seriously disturbed, business men, manufacturers, and producers, including farmers, may be ruined, and disaster result from a failure to understand the needs and the methods of disposition. The Government to-day has 300,000,000 pounds of carpet wool on hand. The wool is valuable and available only by mingling and mixing it with other forms of wool for that particular purpose. Until the next wool crop comes on this wool can only be sold at an enormous sacrifice.

Certainly we do not want that; but what is worse, it would, if thrown on the market, put such a quietus upon the activities of the producers of that class of wool that many of them in all probability would be forced into bankruptcy. However, the wool market is more active than many others. Take the matter of canned goods, if you please, or the disposition of zinc or of lead. The price of zinc at present is so low that half the mines in my State are closed. They have no market. If the Government throws a vast supply of zinc upon the market, the result would be in all probability to shut them all down, throwing thousands of men out of employment, temporarily at least, and indirectly disturbing the stability of other markets.

All these things require at the head of the organization some business genius familiar with them who has had experience with them and who can make his sales accordingly. It is quite true, as the Senator from Missouri says, that anybody can get the market price. The young boy who drives a wagon to market from his father's farm or the man who has large quantities or small quantities of material can always get the market price, but if hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of a particular commodity asks for the market price it must take what can be offered, which means the destruction of the market price for the time being.

Then, Mr. President, there is the question of preservation. To dispose of two and a half billion dollars' worth of goods requires the storage of a great portion of them for a considerable time. Some goods can be stored one way and under one set of conditions that are not at all desirable for others, and with storage goes guarding and preservation. There is no business combination, gigantic as some of them are, that approaches this particular situation. It is the biggest job that any man or set of men ever undertook.

If I were on trial for my life, I might come, I probably would come, to the Senate of the United States for counsel. I know of nobody to whom I would more readily apply under those circumstances than my friend from Missouri [Mr. REED]; but I would not employ him because of his experience in the United States Senate or because of his political belief or because of his experiences in statesmanship; I would go to him because he is a trained, experienced veteran lawyer, capable of serving me in that very exigent situation, because in all probability he

would save me if I could be saved, and I would not expect him to take the job upon a Senator's salary.

Mr. REED. I would not charge the Senator a cent. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator is very generous. I would not ask that. But that being the case, let me substitute some one in my place—Mr. Hoover, for instance. [Laughter.] I am satisfied that my friend from Missouri, under those circumstances, would insist upon charging something more than \$12,000, and he would earn it.

Mr. REED. I admit I would have to be paid for mental anguish. [Laughter.]

Mr. THOMAS. The same would be true if I substituted some other person who did not enjoy the friendship and intimate companionship of the Senator from Missouri.

I do not believe that a man, I do not care how good a salesman he is, who is dependent upon his time for a living and who can make \$12,000 a year in private life is the man to handle this situation. He may be. There are plenty of men of independent fortune who can do it for a nominal salary, and who would probably be glad to do it for a nominal salary, if we could find them. But the department is against a serious situation, and I greatly fear that unless it is properly handled the losses to the Government will be prodigious. If that should be the case, then I fear the very gentlemen who are now putting this restriction upon its powers will be the loudest in their denunciation of the department for its inefficient, unbusinesslike, and expensive methods of administration. Theirs is the responsibility; but it is ours, Mr. President, to give them the opportunity to discharge that responsibility commensurate with its magnitude, and its magnitude is almost inconceivable.

I shall therefore be compelled to vote against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PHELAN. Before the Senator sits down, permit me to say that I am not acquainted with the sales agent nor his methods, but I desire to know if under the statute he is invested with discretion that he may sell or not sell as he sees fit with knowledge of the market and business conditions.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that he has unlimited discretion. I think he ought to have some discretion.

Mr. PHELAN. If he has discretion of course it would make his services more valuable to the Government and the salary ought to be adequate.

Mr. THOMAS. It is inconceivable that a man can occupy that position and discharge it with any sort of efficiency without being invested with considerable discretion.

Mr. PHELAN. Do you know that he has to consult anybody?

Mr. THOMAS. He is under the direction of the Secretary of War.

Mr. PHELAN. He sells then with the approval of the Secretary of War?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; he must. He is not independent of the department.

Mr. PHELAN. What is the period of his employment?

Mr. THOMAS. It is indefinite. It must be, in the nature of things.

Mr. PHELAN. It is safe to presume the employment would not last over the period of one year?

Mr. THOMAS. Except that, if I am correctly informed, the present organization will not be continued beyond the expiration of the present fiscal year without this legislation. I think it will take longer than a year myself.

Mr. PHELAN. Then it will be a matter for the judgment of the legislative body at the expiration of the fiscal year whether they should renew the salary?

Mr. THOMAS. It is always within the power of Congress to enact such new legislation as it may desire.

Mr. PHELAN. What we are doing now is to practically establish the salary for one year at \$25,000.

Mr. THOMAS. What we are proposing is to enable this organization to function in a business way and with as little loss to the Government as possible.

Mr. PHELAN. I am in sympathy with the Senator's remarks. I was trying to find some justification. I believe if he sells \$2,500,000,000 worth of property, is invested with the discretion, with an employment running over a period of probably one year, \$25,000 is not too much.

Mr. THOMAS. If my friend could get \$500,000 a year he would have to live 5,000 years before he would be worth \$2,500,000,000; that gives a faint idea of the magnitude of the task involved.

Mr. PHELAN. All salaries are based in large affairs upon the responsibilities and upon the amount involved.

Mr. THOMAS. And the magnitude of the problems that attend the discharge of the duties.

Mr. PHELAN. And the necessity for strict fidelity in the discharge of the trust.

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes; if a man connected with the Government betrays his trust in any way he ought to be punished; and there are laws which will punish him if they are enforced.

Mr. PHELAN. It does not conduce to strict fidelity in the discharge of a trust to impress a man into service at an inadequate salary.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I do not think so.

Mr. PHELAN. I saw at Camp Mills, in Texas, the other day acres of automobiles which ought to be in use. If he threw those automobiles upon the market, it would be detrimental to the legitimate business of manufacture and sale of automobiles. So there is where he has to study how to dispose of automobiles.

Mr. THOMAS. He could put thousands of men out of employment. They have to be disposed of in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with conditions.

Mr. REED. Pardon a suggestion. It might permit thousands and thousands of people to have automobiles at something besides robber prices. It might break up the automobile trust temporarily.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, pursuing the analogy a little further, does not the Senator know that practically all automobile companies are several months behind in deliveries and that you can not buy an automobile now, to be furnished from the factory, that can be delivered within less than three months?

Mr. THOMAS. I know that the prices are high.

Mr. ROBINSON. I am not talking about prices. You can not secure delivery at all within three months from most of the automobile companies.

Mr. THOMAS. I know prices are very high, and it is due to the fact that the demand is in excess of the supply. I also know that many of these Government automobiles have been by legislation turned over to the Agricultural Department. How many I do not know. I am quite sure that many of them could be sold, and it would operate to reduce prices, and they ought to be sold if that is the case. But, of course, that is one line of investment which the Government made during the war, the solution of which now confronts us.

Mr. PHELAN. There is nothing to prevent the sale of the automobiles. I merely cited that as an example of the stupendous and delicate character of the task.

Mr. THOMAS. On the contrary, they must be sold, except where they are turned over to the Department of Agriculture or other departments. The same is true of trucks, hundreds of which have been placed at the disposal of the highway commissions of the different States, and will so be in use.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senate to a statement made the other day by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] in reference to Mr. Hare, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Colorado to it.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not wedded to Mr. Hare. I do not think he ought to be kept in the position if he is inefficient.

Mr. MCKELLAR. This is a statement made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] said, among other things, in speaking of this amendment:

The director of sales is Mr. C. W. Hare, appointed by the Secretary of War, who has been urged to leave his business to undertake this work and employment.

The Senator from Kansas interrupted a moment or two later and said:

Mr. CURTIS. I ask the Senator from New York if this item includes the disposition of aeroplanes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It does.

Mr. CURTIS. I am told—I do not know whether or not there is anything in it—that aeroplanes which have cost the Government \$20,000,000 have been sold back to the same firms which manufactured them for about \$2,000,000. I am also told that machines that cost this Government from \$6,000 to \$8,000 are being sold back to the companies from which they were purchased at \$800. I am further told—and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] was present on the day before yesterday when the statement was made—that there are a number of individuals who are ready to pay more for these machines than the Government is getting for them.

If that is true, there ought to be some amendment provided for in the bill requiring the Government to sell those machines where we can get the best bids for them. It is neither right nor fair to the Government that machines costing \$20,000,000 shall be sold back to the manufacturers for \$2,000,000. I do not care who attempts to defend it, it is not defensible.

After some little colloquy, which need not for the present be read, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to what Mr. CURTIS further said:

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman who called upon the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] and myself—or rather he called upon me, and I introduced him to the Senator from Indiana because that Senator was on the committee and the chairman was absent—stated that he and others had tried to bid upon these machines, but that they were not given an opportunity to do so; in fact, that their bids were refused. He said the same course was being pursued with reference to the machines that were now on hand; that they were trying to get the War Department to let individuals bid on these machines; and he stated to the Senator from Indiana and to me that he was ready to bid more than was being bid by the Curtiss Co.

I take it, in view of that testimony and in view of this further testimony, that before a committee of the Senate, before the Public Lands Committee, as I understand it, Mr. Hare was asked what salary he was getting, and he stated that he was getting a salary from the Government of \$4,000—

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

Mr. MCKELLAR. In just a moment. At the same time he was drawing a salary from the United Gas & Improvement Co. of \$15,000. That was the statement as to his salary. As I understand it, he came before the committee and said he was getting a salary of \$15,000 and other perquisites that amounted to \$14,000, making \$29,000 instead of \$15,000 that he testified to in the first instance.

Mr. THOMAS. Before what committee?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Before the Committee on Military Affairs. These are reasons why I think there should be some restriction. In the first place, I think this amendment should have gone out, and I want to reserve the right to have a separate vote on it in the Senate. In the next place, I think at all events we should limit the salaries that are to be paid out under this lump-sum appropriation.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. I simply want to say, in fairness to Mr. Hare, that he had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the sale of these airplanes to the Curtiss Co. Not only that, but he disapproves of it and deprecates the fact that they were sold at that figure. That is the fact about that matter. He had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Indiana be kind enough to inform us who is responsible for the sale, if he knows?

Mr. NEW. Those airplanes were sold by the War Department pursuant to an idea and policy that it has, but with which I am not at all sure that I agree. They were sold by the authority, at least, of the Secretary of War. The facts to which the Senator from Kansas referred are simply these: A number of cases have arisen where young men who have served in the Army during the war and are now discharged have sought and tried to buy one or more planes, in each case, however, limited to a very small number. I think in one case an aviator wanted to buy 10. The department has felt that it is not good policy to sell such individuals airplanes, and it did negotiate to sell them back to the Curtiss Co. As I have said, I am not indorsing that, I am not approving it at all, but am simply stating the facts. But Mr. Hare was not only not responsible for that, but had nothing to do with it.

The idea that the department advanced was that they did not want to enter into the retail sale of airplanes; that by doing that they could not very well sell in one case and not sell in another; that it would put them squarely into the retail airplane trade, and through promiscuous selling planes might fall into the hands of people who are not qualified to use them; that accidents might happen as the result of sales to people who are not competent to fly the machines; that in unskilled hands they would be dangerous both to the aviator and to the public. So they considered it best to sell directly back to the Curtiss Co. and let them be responsible for the disposition of the machines; and, as the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] reminds me, most of the planes are not in condition to be sold; nearly all of them require more or less repairs to be made. In that shape they were sold back to the Curtiss people, who can repair them and then sell them on their own account. That is the explanation of this policy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desired to ask the Senator from Indiana a question before he took his seat. The question we are discussing is rather aside from the amendment, and I do not want to prolong the debate; but I want to ask the Senator if he knows who originated the brilliant idea that the man who sells a machine must see to it that the man who buys it is qualified to handle it?

Mr. NEW. I do not know, Mr. President. I am simply stating the story of this as it comes to me from officers who are connected with the War Department as a statement of their reasons.

Mr. REED. If that be true, I think all the men who have sold mowing machines and reapers in this country have been very derelict in their duty, or the Government has been in not

taking those machines over, for there has been many a finger sacrificed by a boy who did not know enough to run such machines. I think it an absurd reason, and I say now just this word in passing: It will be very hard to justify the sale back to a factory of something it produced at one-tenth of the amount it exacted from the Government. Whoever has done that, I think, will have some explanations to make. I had no idea until this matter came up a few minutes ago that the transaction had taken place, and when I asked the question I had no conception of who might or might not be responsible for it.

The people of the United States have paid for this war, and they have paid willingly and generously; they were willing not only to expend all the money that was necessary to win the war, but they were willing to overlook excessive prices that might have been charged or paid at a time when the work had to be accomplished under emergency conditions, and where the risk was great not only to the manufacturer but to the Government itself; but the people of the United States will look with disfavor of the gravest kind upon any attempt now to plunder the Government or to speculate to the Government's disadvantage.

I believe there is much of wisdom and right in what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] said when he stated that vast quantities of raw materials or manufactured materials should not be suddenly thrown upon the market to break the market. Upon the other hand, such materials should not be held back for the purpose of sustaining the market at a fictitious point or for the purpose of enabling manufacturers to continue to reap exorbitant profits and to profiteer after the war is over.

The illustration of the automobile is a good one. I know an unfortunate individual who had to buy an automobile only a few days ago. He paid over 50 per cent beyond the price that was charged about two and one-half years ago. When he went to get the machine he found he could not get one in New York at all unless he waited until October. Then he had to register, getting his number or taking his chances in numerical order. He afterwards learned of an automobile that could be "caught on the fly," and he bought it before it was unloaded from the train. With the market in that shape there is no justification for not selling to the people of the United States these automobiles, not to the extent of breaking the market, but to the extent of satisfying the wants of the people and meeting the demand, as suggested by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. PHELAN. Does not the Senator think that that ought to be the policy of the Government sales agent, if he is a fit agent?

Mr. REED. I am discussing another question, but I will say to the Senator from California that that ought to be the policy of the agent.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just let me conclude in a moment. That policy ought to be pursued with all of these materials. I am told there is a large amount of meat products on hand. Those meat products ought to be sold to the people of the United States, not to break the market but to ease the situation. The market of the United States ought to be relieved. I intend to have something to say about this in a few days, but not now further than to make this suggestion: I heard of an instance the other day of the proprietor of some large ships who wanted to take on a cargo of wheat. The wheat was needed in Europe; there was a market for it in Europe; there was a manifest surplus here; and yet he was refused permission to load those vessels with wheat. In the meantime our Government has guaranteed the price of wheat, and, of course, it will pay that price, because the Government is in the habit of keeping its obligations; but if there is a market abroad that will absorb the wheat, if there is a surplus, and if there are bottoms ready to haul it, it seems a strange policy that would deny the privilege of shipping.

I think—and with this observation I will take my seat and apologize for having consumed this much time on the bill—that the time has come when the markets of the United States ought to be released, at least the policy ought to be inaugurated beginning the release of these markets. Possibly it can not all be done at once. It is said that this gentleman is here, that that is his business, but I still go back to the proposition and say that I think we can get a man for \$12,000 a year perfectly capable and perfectly competent to transact this business.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there will be a recess taken until 8 o'clock this evening; but it is necessary to have a short executive session in the meantime, and I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 8 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The Senate reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The Senate resumes the consideration of the Army appropriation bill.

ARMY APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5227) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hale	Moses	Spencer
Chamberlain	Harrison	New	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Newberry	Swanson
Dillingham	Kenyon	Nugent	Wadsworth
Edge	Keyes	Overman	Warren
Elkins	Knox	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Lenroot	Smith, Ariz.	
Frelinghuysen	McKellar	Smoot	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAPPER, Mr. GERRY, Mr. HARDING, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. PHIPPS, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. SUTHERLAND, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. TRAMMELL, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

Mr. HARRIS entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. WATSON, Mr. McNARY, Mr. GAY, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. PHELAN, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in view of some inquiries that were made this afternoon as to how this particular bureau of the Government was being run, I wish to read, for the information of the Senate, a short article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, as follows:

BIDS FOR ARMY FOOD TOO LOW—WAR DEPARTMENT WILL PROBABLY SEEK NEW ONES IN SMALLER LOTS.

Bids which were opened Friday for surplus Army meat and vegetables are almost certain to be rejected, it is intimated at the War Department.

When bids for the 142,000,000 pounds of bacon and canned meat and 5,500,000 cases of canned vegetables were opened in 13 Army supply zone centers, they were found to be restricted largely to packers and big dealers.

The War Department, after its announcement that the goods would be sold abroad was withdrawn, offered to permit State and municipal penal, charitable, and educational institutions to bid for the supplies. But as the minimum quantity to be sold was a carload lot of one commodity, few institutions were able to bid.

At Chicago there were but 11 bids for the millions of pounds in that zone. These were from packers principally. One packer bid for the entire supply of bacon. Similar experiences were reported throughout the country.

Secretary of War Baker said that bids would be rejected if they were found unsatisfactory. Officers in the office of the War Department director of sales said early reports on the bids were enough to show they would be unsatisfactory.

Secretary Baker indicated that if new bids are asked, the requirement that forces bidders to quote prices on a 30,000-pound minimum will be removed.

Prices of most bids have been most disappointing to Army officials. Though there has been no reduction in prices of meat, either to dealers or to the public, since the armistice was signed, meat that cost the Government as much as 40 cents a pound would bring, if the present

bids were accepted, only from 20 to 25 cents a pound. Retail prices to-day for similar supplies range from 65 to 80 cents a pound.

If the War Department has to ask for new bids, Secretary Baker indicated that dealers closer to the public than those who quoted prices last time will be reached.

I am glad to hear that Secretary Baker is at last waking up to the necessity of getting value for the Government's property.

In the same connection I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article from the Baltimore Sun of June 24, as follows:

FOOD STILL GOING UP—PRICES NEARLY AS HIGH AS MAXIMUM WAR SCALE—FEW ARTICLES ARE CHEAPER—COST OF 22 COMMODITIES HAS RISEN 58 PER CENT DURING LAST FOUR YEARS.

WASHINGTON, June 23.

And still the price of food goes up. For 22 selected items the retail price in May, 1919, declares a statement issued from the Department of Labor to-day, was 2 per cent higher than in April, 1919; 17 per cent higher than May, 1918; and 92 per cent higher than May, 1913.

May I interpolate here that while prices are so high this branch of the department, to the head of which it is proposed to pay \$25,000 a year, has put out proposals that no one substantially but the packers can bid on because bids are required on at least 30,000-pound lots. Penal institutions in the States can not bid on this food because the quantity is too large. Other institutions of a like kind, charitable institutions, can not bid on it because the quantity is too large. The only people that can bid on it, under the rules laid down by the department, are the packers; and the packers are only offering a little more than one-half what the food is selling for at wholesale on the market.

But I proceed:

It is estimated that the average price of food is now within approximately 1 per cent of what it was in December, 1918, when it reached its highest point.

Out of 41 articles for which prices are received by the Bureau of Labor Statistics each month from retail dealers, 26 advanced in price in May, as compared with April of this year. These same 26 articles advanced in April over the preceding months with these exceptions: Bacon, butter, lamb, oranges, and plate beef increased in April, but decreased in May; evaporated milk, nut margarine, corn flakes, raisins, and tea decreased in April, but increased in May; and bread, canned peas, rice, and sugar have remained the same since March.

But the chief of this bureau—the only man who can be found in the United States to put these goods on the market, as it appears—says that they must not be sold so that the people can get the benefit of them, but they must be put on the market so that only the packers can buy them, and the packers will pay only a little over 50 per cent. No wonder the Secretary of War interposed and stopped the business and required new bids!

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the last statement of the Senator is somewhat inaccurate. Mr. Hare himself decided not to accept the bids. The Secretary of War did not interpose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I read from an article a few moments ago—

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator must not believe everything he reads in articles.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not believe everything I read in articles.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask, then, if it was also Mr. Hare who restricted the bids to sales in carload lots?

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is a very apt question at this time, and I refer it to the chairman of the committee, if he will answer it. Did Mr. Hare provide that there should be sales in carload lots only?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am sure I do not know whether he did or not, whether the Secretary of War or the Quartermaster General or Mr. Hare made the original suggestion; but I offer this suggestion: If these enormous supplies of goods are to be sold as the retailer sells them, case by case, the Senate might as well make up its mind that it will have to appropriate, instead of \$900,000, something like 10 or 15 million dollars to provide for the Government going into the retail business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just a moment. You will lose a great deal more from your net cost in that way than if you can manage to sell them by carload lots.

It is a strange thing to me that the public does not take advantage of the opportunity to buy even in carload lots, because there is nothing to prevent 10 or 12 consumers joining together and buying a carload; but you can well imagine the enormous expense and the enormous labor it would involve for the Government to establish retail stores, and deal this stuff out piece by piece. It would be tremendous.

The truth of the matter is, in one respect, in relation to the canned meats, that they are the kind of canned meats that the public is not buying to-day anyway. The public is not living on canned roast beef.

Mr. MCKELLAR. What about bacon? Surely bacon is as salable as wool, or copper, or any other commodity.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no information on bacon. I am speaking of canned meats. As I understand, as I said before, these goods are all packed as they were packed originally for export. They were put up to be shipped abroad for our Army. They are not packed in such a way that a retail grocer can readily take them and put them on his shelves. The invitations for the bids were sent to 40,000 different retail grocers and retail butchers, everybody in the trade as well as the institutions to which the Senator refers. The department, of course, is gravely disappointed that it can not get them to bid on them except at something less than one-half of the original cost.

Mr. MCKELLAR. What else could be expected?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Now, you have that alternative. Either you must build up an enormous retail machine, an organization, and sell this stuff out in dozens and dozens of places, case by case, or else you must try to dispose of it more cheaply by carload lots. I can not see that anybody has been criminally negligent about it. It is the first experiment in endeavoring to sell these canned meats by carload lots. It seems to me that eventually the public will become wise to the fact that 10 or 12 men or 15 or 20 men can club together and buy a carload and divide it amongst themselves; or half a dozen grocers can get together and buy one carload. Of course the public and the trade have to be educated to this; but I do not think either the Secretary of War or the director of sales is particularly to blame for the refusal of the public to purchase the goods.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I have a very different notion about it. I think it would be very much better for the Government to put this bacon and canned meat on the market in reasonable lots, where wholesalers could buy and where it would not go into the hands of the packers, who are interested in buying as cheaply as they can, and, of course, selling at the best price.

Here is a staple article, bacon, almost like money itself, selling at retail at enormous prices; and here is the Government director of sales, to whom it is proposed to pay \$25,000 a year because he is the only man in the country fitted for it, who proposes to sell on terms on which only the packers, apparently, can buy. Will that do the country any good? Will the people of this country get their meat any cheaper?

I say that if there were nothing else apparent, this would be sufficient reason for this body to rescind the action that it took this morning; and surely, with these facts before us, we ought to agree to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland and put restrictions about the matter. I do not believe that this food should be sold at retail; but if we have the right kind of man, that is looking after the Government's interests and looking after the people's interests, and not arranging these matters so that only the packers can buy, it will be better for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who, I see, is absent. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. TRAMMELL (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HARDING. I transfer the general pair I have with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. FALL. I understand that the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], who is unavoidably detained. I understand that he would vote the same way that I have voted, so I will let my vote stand.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the absence on official business of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]. I understand that he is paired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The Chair announces that he has a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], which he transfers to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and allows his vote in the negative to stand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] are necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

- The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER];
- The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];
- The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];
- The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH];
- The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS];
- The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and
- The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—27.

Borah	Kellogg	McCormick	Reed
Capper	Kenyon	McKellar	Sheppard
Curtis	Keyes	McNary	Stanley
France	King	Moses	Trammell
Gay	Knox	Nugent	Walsh, Mass.
Harding	La Follette	Overman	Wolcott
Harrison	Lenroot	Pomereene	

NAYS—22.

Ashurst	Hale	Phelan	Wadsworth
Brandegee	Harris	Phipps	Warren
Chamberlain	Henderson	Smith, Ariz.	Watson
Edge	Kirby	Spencer	Williams
Elkins	New	Sutherland	
Freelinghuysen	Newberry	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—47.

Ball	Gerry	Martin	Shields
Bankhead	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Beckham	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Calder	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Md.
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Owen	Smith, S. C.
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Penrose	Sterling
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Swanson
Dillingham	Kendrick	Poindexter	Townsend
Fall	Lodge	Ransdell	Underwood
Fernald	McCumber	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	McLean	Sherman	

So Mr. FRANCE'S amendment to the amendment of Mr. WADSWORTH was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. THOMAS. I desire to give notice that when the bill comes into the Senate I shall reserve the right to take another vote upon the amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 17 strike out lines 17 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

That not to exceed \$5,000,000 of the unexpended balances on June 30, 1919, of the appropriations "Registration and selection for military service, fiscal year 1919," contained in the Army appropriation act for 1919, approved July 9, 1918, and the deficiency appropriation act for 1919, approved November 4, 1918, are reappropriated and made available for the fiscal year 1920, for all expenses necessary for the completion, preservation, and transportation of the records pertaining to the draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, including the employment of the necessary clerical and other help for duty in the office of The Adjutant General of the Army in connection with the arrangement, operation, and maintenance of the files of those records: *Provided*, That such part of this appropriation as may be necessary shall be available for the employment of clerical help required to furnish to the adjutants general of the several States statements of service of all persons from

those States who entered the military service during the war with Germany: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be disbursed by such officer as may be designated by the Secretary of War for the purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. In line 22, page 17, I move to strike out "\$5,000,000" and substitute therefor "\$3,500,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely satisfactory, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement by Gen. Harris. It explains fully why this reduction should be made.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. McKELLAR.

I called Gen. Harris over the phone, and he said that the records from the Judge Advocate General's Office fill a building the size of the State, War, and Navy Building three times over. That the records are now in the buildings at Washington Barracks; that he should have an organization having for its purpose the rearranging and reclassification of these records.

There are 500,000 men under indictment in the Department of Justice. The papers concerning these men are, of course, in these files.

There are 200,000 men under indictment by the military forces for military offenses, and a large number of these men are confined, and must be so confined until these records are opened up and classified and the information furnished to them.

He expects to have a separate division in charge of these records. He estimates that it will take 2,000 clerks for one year to classify and rearrange these records, and that it will take 1,000 clerks one year to furnish to the various adjutants general of the States memoranda with reference to men from such States or information concerning them.

He believes that an appropriation of \$3,500,000 will do this work. After this year it will only take a few clerks to keep these records in condition and furnish reports as to them.

The 3,000 clerks will not average as much as \$1,440 and probably not more than \$1,200, but it will take \$100,000 or more to purchase the necessary files and cases. Incidentally these should be secured from other departments of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to call up the amendment that was passed over, on page 52, line 6, under the heading "Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, line 6, strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$75,000."

Mr. SMOOT. I have not any objection to the amendment inserting \$75,000 for \$90,000, and after that amendment is agreed to I desire to amend the item by offering an amendment to the paragraph.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. After the words "fiscal year 1920" I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the numerals "1920, \$75,000," insert the following proviso:

Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the Public Buildings Commission in Government-owned buildings.

Mr. SMOOT. I will simply say to the Senate that the Public Buildings Commission has this day made their first assignment of space in Government-owned buildings in the District of Columbia. There will be other changes, no doubt, in the future, and this amendment is absolutely necessary because of the fact that up to the present time we will be compelled to rent what is known as the Lemon Building. That building rents for \$10,000 per annum. It may be that we can give the employees of the Government who are in that building a space in Government buildings hereafter. If so, this will not be available for paying rent for the building.

The balance of the appropriation is for storage space, and I want to say in passing that the Government of the United States is very short of storage space to-day, and we can not get away from renting space for storage in the District—at least until some future provision is made for the purpose of erecting buildings for storage purposes.

For that reason I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator whether the amendment is to follow the appropriation of \$75,000?

Mr. SMOOT. It will follow the appropriation of \$75,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KIRBY. Let it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. On page 52, under the subhead "Rent of buildings, Quartermaster Corps," the clause reads:

For rent of buildings and parts of buildings in the District of Columbia for military purposes during the fiscal year 1920, \$75,000.

The Senator from Utah proposes the following amendment to the amendment:

Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available if space is provided by the public buildings commission in Government-owned buildings.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent to offer one other amendment, because it may be that I can not be here in the morning, as the subcommittee on the sundry civil appropriation bill meets at 10 o'clock, and I think the committee desires to get the bill marked up to-morrow.

I move to strike out, on page 72, beginning with line 8, down to and including the word "appropriations," in line 15, the following words:

That hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for use outside of the District of Columbia in connection with the support of the Army and the National Guard may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when in the opinion of the Secretary of War such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriations.

I will state the reason for the amendment. The War Department thought section 11 of public act No. 314, which amends the printing laws, prevented the publication by the War Department of any document or printed matter of any kind in the Canal Zone, in the Philippine Islands, and in Guam. But, Mr. President, I wish to say that that is not the case. Just the other day the Joint Committee on Printing at a meeting authorized that "all printing, binding, and blank-book work required to be done in and for the exclusive use of any Government service in Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Panama Canal, Porto Rico, Philippines, the Virgin Islands, or in any other place outside of the United States, may be done elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office." With that order issued by the Joint Committee on Printing, it is useless to have this paragraph in the bill, and I move that these lines be stricken out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah moves that beginning with line 8 and ending with the word "appropriations," in line 15 on page 72, the matter stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call attention to the proviso on page 34—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I beg the Senator's pardon, but do I understand that the pay of the Army amendment has been adopted, commencing on page 18, at the bottom of the page?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it has not. I am just calling the attention of the Chair to the fact that it has not been agreed to.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I thought the Senator said page 34. It begins on page 18.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is where the particular item I want to call attention to is to be found. All relating to the pay of the Army was passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the proposed amendment.

The SECRETARY. The committee amendment is found on page 18, beginning with line 24, to and including line 17 on page 34, the proposition being to strike out and insert provisions for pay of the Army—

Mr. McKELLAR. I move to strike out the proviso in line 13 on page 34, beginning with the word "*Provided*," and including lines 14, 15, 16, and 17. That proviso reads as follows:

Provided, That any part of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919 that is not required for the service of that fiscal year may be transferred to the credit of the appropriation for the pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1920.

Mr. President, I have looked through the hearings and I find there is no memorandum of any kind, or if there is such a memorandum I have been unable to find it, and I am informed by the chairman of the committee that there is no memorandum in the hearings on this proposition. I find also that the specific pay of the Army is stated opposite each one of the items and that this proviso apparently adds \$100,000,000, that being the sum estimated by the chairman of the committee to be added to the pay of the Army.

If it is subject to a point of order—and I am not sufficiently well versed in parliamentary law to say whether it is—I desire to make a point of order against it. If it is not subject to a point of order, I want to insist upon my motion to amend. I think it

ought to be stricken out for the reason that it reappropriates an indefinite sum, which is always bad legislation. What we ought to do is to appropriate for this year and let the money be turned back into the Treasury under the law. Let us appropriate what is necessary under the bill. There is no item to which this corresponds in any way, and it ought to go out of the bill. It has no place in the bill, and it ought to go out. I hope if it is subject to a point of order, the Chair will so rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I ask for the yeas and nays on the question whether the proviso shall remain.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I explained at some length to the Senate last night the meaning and effect of this proviso, and I do not intend to detain the Senate on it now. If the proviso is stricken out I have the figures already to add \$100,000,000 to certain items in the pay accounts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator agree that it may go out and let those figures be added?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I can not do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I request the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the vote is taken, I move the following amendment to the committee amendment: In the part of the appropriation for pay of the Army for the fiscal year 1919, after the figures "1919," on page 34, line 15, I move to insert the words "not exceeding \$100,000,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will accept that in behalf of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over will be found on page 46, line 22, under the heading "Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, Engineers, etc.," where the committee proposes to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been unable to find in the hearings, in the short time we have had the hearings before us in print, anything about Cavalry horses. May I ask the chairman of the committee who testified and what was said about the need of horses? Is there anything about it in the published hearings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; the testimony of Col. Hanney, of the Quartermaster Corps, who was brought before the committee by Gen. Lord, goes into it at some length.

I think I can give in a very few sentences the horse situation. One hundred sixty-two thousand seven hundred and twenty-two animals were sold after the armistice was declared, and principally during January, February, and March, 1919, owing to their being of no immediate use during the demobilization period and until another army had been recruited to cover the country's needs. These animals brought an average price of \$113.48 per head as contrasted with the assertion which was made here last night that they averaged \$90 per head. One hundred and thirteen dollars per head, horses and mules included. They cost the Government approximately \$185 per head. Had they been retained in service it would have cost \$98.83 per head to have foraged these animals, exclusive of labor, for the past six months. It ought to be remembered that these animals were in auxiliary remount stations. If the Government now buys animals at an average price of \$190 per head there will therefore be a saving of about \$22.31 per head for forage alone, and the service will secure younger animals.

Mr. President, here is the present situation about the horses on hand and the net requirements, divided into classes:

Horses for remounts, total requirement, 1,000; none on hand, net requirements, 1,000. This is based, I may say, upon an army of 400,000 men. Unit cost, \$150. Total cost, \$150,000. This estimate was made by the purchasing officer at Kansas City, Mo.

Horses for officers entitled to public mounts: Total requirements, 7,982; number on hand, 3,168; net requirements, 4,814; unit cost, \$190; total cost, \$914,660. That estimate was reached after conference by the War Department with the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Agricultural Department.

Horses for Cavalry to equip one Cavalry division and one regiment of Cavalry with each combat Infantry division: Total requirements, 31,833; number on hand, 12,796; net requirements, 19,037; unit cost, \$190.

Pack horses for Cavalry: Total requirements, 900; number on hand, none; net requirements, 900; unit cost, \$150; total cost of horses needed for Cavalry, \$3,754,120.

Horses for Artillery: Total requirements, 25,614; number on hand, 15,829; net requirements, 9,785; unit cost, \$190; total cost, \$1,864,280.

Horses for Signal Corps: Total requirements, 573; number on hand, 275; net requirements, 298; unit cost, \$190; total cost, \$56,620.

Horses for Engineers: Total requirements, 2,611; number on hand, 1,403; net requirements, 1,208; unit cost, \$190; total cost, \$229,520.

Horses for Infantry, mounted: Total requirements, 7,747; on hand, 3,454; net requirements, 4,293; unit cost, \$190; total cost, \$815,670.

Horses for Hospital Corps: Total requirements, 132; number on hand, 52; net requirements, 80; unit cost, \$190; total cost, \$15,200.

Reserved for purchase of private mounts, \$5,000 worth.

Expenses incident to purchase—that is, traveling expenses of the remount officers who travel about making these purchases and their clerks and veterinarians who accompany them, the clerks to keep the records of the purchases and the veterinarians to examine the horses. That item is \$145,522.

Horses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, to be used in the six weeks' summer encampments which are provided under the national defense act of 1916; total amount needed, \$231,040.

Therefore, the total requirements are 79,912 horses; number on hand, 36,977; the net requirements are 42,935, at a total cost of \$8,181,632; and the committee gives them \$5,000,000, \$3,181,632 less than they ask.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the amount of that item with reference to the cost and expense of procuring the animals, the cost of the veterinarians and the officers and the clerks?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The sum of \$145,522.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator when did that appear in the hearings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This did not appear in the hearings. I sent for this table in order to have it in succinct form. These figures, in rambling testimony and in conversation between the officers and members of the committee, were in large part given to us, but they were not given to us in such form that they could be presented as one table. I ask that this table be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Appropriation—Horses for Cavalry, Artillery, and Engineers.
[Estimate for horses fiscal year 1920—For Army of 400,000 men.]

Kind and use for which required.	Total requirements.	On hand.	Net requirements.	Unit cost.	Total cost.	Remarks.
Horses for remounts. Three-year-old horses which have been bred under agreement with the Department of Agriculture.	1,000	1,000	\$150.00	\$150,000.00	Estimated cost for year 1920 (purchasing officer, Kansas City, Mo.).
Horses for officers entitled to public mounts.	7,982	3,168	4,814	190.00	914,660.00	Conference with Bureau of Animal Industry.
Horses for Cavalry. One Cavalry division and one regiment of Cavalry with each combat division.	31,833	12,796	19,037	190.00	3,754,120.00	(By Remount Division. No estimate has been made for maintenance.
Horses, pack, for Cavalry.	900	900	150.00	135,000.00	
Horses for Artillery.	25,614	15,829	9,785	190.00	1,864,280.00	
Horses for Signal Corps.	573	275	298	190.00	56,620.00	
Horses for Engineers.	2,611	1,403	1,208	190.00	229,520.00	
Horses for Infantry, mounted.	7,747	3,454	4,293	190.00	815,670.00	
Horses for Hospital Corps.	132	52	80	190.00	15,200.00	
Reserved for purchase of private mounts.	5,000.00	
Expenses incident to purchase.	145,522.00	
Horses for R. O. T. C.	1,520	1,520	190.00	231,040.00	
Total.	79,912	36,977	42,935	8,181,632.00	

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to the horse situation, I desire to read from the hearings. I read from page 189, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. The House gave you \$1,000,000?
Col. HANNAY. Yes.
The CHAIRMAN. You asked for \$10,000,000?
Col. HANNAY. We asked for \$10,000,000.
The CHAIRMAN. Do you know upon what theory they placed it at \$1,000,000?
Col. HANNAY. I do not; no, sir. These figures were based on the equipment of 21 peace-strength divisions, or an Army averaging 509,000 men.

I now read from quite a distinguished authority:

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know if any officer can give us the information, how many horses we now own in the United States that have not been sold, and how many mules, and how many pack mules?

Col. WOOD. We can put that in the record.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems foolish to purchase horses if at the present time we own horses and are not retaining them.

A statement that I indorse, by the way—

Col. WOOD. The point, Mr. Chairman, is this: That there would not be enough for an army of 509,000 men. This was figured up by Col. Hardeman, who is in charge of remounts and has been in charge of remounts for some time, and he figured in the same way that we have in other things for this organization.

Col. HANNAY. I can give you the entire figures. I have them here. For instance, for horses for Cavalry, the stock on hand is 12,796.

Senator THOMAS. You mean in America or on both sides?

Col. HANNAY. That is in America.

Col. WOOD. At what date?

Col. HANNAY. February 28—March 1. The total requirements are 23,797 riding horses and 1,200 pack horses, at the estimated cost of \$190 for riding horses and \$150 for pack, which makes \$4,701,430 for horses. I can give you any of the items on which this is based, showing the number on hand; horses for officers entitled to public mounts, the number on hand is 3,168 and the requirement is 6,017. Unit cost, \$190, making \$1,143,230.

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. I do not think this needs to be taken down. In the House hearings Col. Hardeman testified on this subject.

I want to call the attention of the Senate especially to this testimony of Col. Hardeman, the one who is at the head of the remount station, and the other appears to be the chief horseman:

(Senator FRELINGHUYSEN here read from page 73 of the House hearings as follows:)

Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir. We are estimating for the purchase of draft animals for the Regular Army, \$4,604,500.

It seems that it was not considerably less, but relatively somewhat less.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Those are draft animals.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are draft animals.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is entirely different.

The CHAIRMAN. For the purchase.

Col. HARDEMAN. Purchase; yes, sir. For the purchase of pack animals, \$503,370, a total for the Regular Army of \$5,107,870. For the National Guard pack animals, \$126,420.

The CHAIRMAN. It is contended that you have a great number of animals on hand that could be utilized for these purposes?

Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then what is the need for the purchase of a large number of additional animals?

Col. HARDEMAN. We have sold a great many, in order to save forage—the upkeep. We have sold altogether 162,800 animals.

The CHAIRMAN. How many animals have you on hand now?

Col. HARDEMAN. On the 1st of July we expect to have 83,000 and some hundreds.

Naturally, with 83,000 and some hundreds of animals on the 1st of July it is not incumbent upon this Congress to appropriate \$5,000,000 for the purchase of horses, in my judgment, and I hope the amendment to the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York to say last night that on the war strength of 400,000 men which we are providing for in this bill, about the 30th of September the Army would be reduced to 209,000. Was that the number?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be reduced to 322,000 men.

Mr. HARRISON. To 322,000; but if it was reduced to what the House provided, it would be two hundred and some odd thousand, would it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be 195,000.

Mr. HARRISON. And that it would go down more than that a little later on?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it would stay at 195,000 for the last nine months of the fiscal year.

Mr. HARRISON. I see; it would be three hundred and some odd thousand, then, about the 30th of September. If the Senator from Tennessee had proceeded further in the testimony of

Col. Hardeinan he would have found this statement in the hearings before the House committee:

The CHAIRMAN. How many do you propose to purchase?
Col. HARDEMAN. We propose to purchase 36,214 riding horses; 14,212 draft horses; 1,200 pack horses; 18,418 draft mules; and 2,397 pack mules for the Regular Army.

The CHAIRMAN. That is about half the number you sold?
Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir; about half.
The CHAIRMAN. You have sold 162,000, I understood you to say?
Col. HARDEMAN. 162,280.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I understood; and while I did not take the exact figures that you gave as to purchases, I had made a vague estimate of between 70,000 and 80,000, probably not that many, that you expect to purchase.

Mr. DENT. Let him give those figures again.
Col. HARDEMAN. We propose to purchase 36,214 riding horses, 14,212 draft horses, 1,200 pack horses, 18,418 draft mules, and 2,397 pack and riding mules.

The CHAIRMAN. That is 72,000 animals, in round numbers?
Col. HARDEMAN. Yes, sir.
Mr. CRAIG. That estimate is based on a supposed Army of 500,000 men, is it?

Col. HARDEMAN. Five hundred thousand men; yes, sir.
Mr. CRAIG. Suppose the Army is left at 200,000 or 250,000; you would have all the mounts you needed, would you not?
Col. HARDEMAN. We would have approximately the number we need now; yes, sir.

Mr. CRAIG. And unless we increase the Regular Army to 500,000 you would not need these horses?

Col. HARDEMAN. That is based on 4 combat divisions at war strength, 16 at peace strength, and a Cavalry division.

The CHAIRMAN. How are you off for Cavalry horses?
Col. HARDEMAN. We have sufficient for present needs. We have sufficient of all classes of animals for present needs.

Mr. WISE. How about the horses?
Col. HARDEMAN. The horses averaged a little less than \$90, and they will cost about \$190 apiece to buy them back.

Mr. WISE. So that both the mules and the horses will cost you, on the average, about \$100 more than you sold them for?

So it would seem, Mr. President, since we saw fit to sell 162,000 of these animals in this country during the first part of this year, and since we shall have, as stated by the Senator from Tennessee—about how many was it—70,000 on the 1st of July?

Mr. McKELLAR. We shall have eighty-three thousand and some hundreds.

Mr. HARRISON. We shall have 83,000 on the 1st of July; and therefore it seems to me very improper and unwise for us to proceed to make an appropriation at the same time to buy back horses on which we are losing \$100 apiece. I think the other House was most liberal in providing for an appropriation of \$1,000,000, and that we ought to repudiate the action of the Senate committee and to stand by the House in this matter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course the Senate will be master of the situation. I desire to make one or two observations on the situation in connection with the assertion of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that we have lost money by selling these horses. As a matter of fact, we have saved \$22.31 a head by doing so. Their cost in forage alone for six months would have been \$98, and that does not include the labor in taking care of them.

Mr. HARRISON. But if the Senator from New York will permit me—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Just one moment. They were not sold at \$100 loss. The average cost was \$185, and they were sold at an average of \$113.

Mr. HARRISON. I got the figures I have stated from Col. Hardeinan's testimony.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was the official statement of the War Department which I read into the RECORD a moment ago. I will read just a portion of it again in order to straighten this matter out:

These animals—

The 162,000 that were sold—

Brought an average price of \$113.48 per head—

And incidentally we can make up our minds that they sold the poorest horses they had.

They cost the Government approximately \$185 per head. Had they been retained in service it would have cost \$98.83 per head to have foraged these animals, exclusive of labor, for the past six months. Now, if the Government buys animals at an average price of \$190, there will therefore be a saving of \$22.31 per head for forage alone.

So we are not losing money. Had we kept these 162,000 horses, "eating their heads off" for six months, every one of them would have cost us \$98.83 more. We would have had the horses to-day, it is true, but by selling them in January and rebuying in July we saved just that amount of money. It all seems simple to me.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator two questions, with his permission: Is not that apparent discrepancy to be accounted for because of the fact that the mules which were sold—and I gathered from what the Senator said that mules were also sold—brought a price greatly in excess of \$113, whereas

the horses sold practically for \$90 each, according to the testimony of the officer to whom the Senator from Mississippi referred?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The average price is on the horses and mules combined. I regret to say that I have not yet presented to the Senate the estimate for mules that are to be purchased. They want \$4,000,000 for that.

Mr. KING. In addition to \$5,000,000 for horses?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Ten million dollars for horses. The committee has only given them \$5,000,000 altogether, instead of the one million appropriated by the House. This estimate is based on an Army of 400,000 men, and not on an Army of 500,000.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know whether the sales have continued down until this time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the sales have ceased.

Mr. KING. How long since have they ceased?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not know the date, but they ceased some time ago. Of course, the Senator will understand that there are always a few horses being sold—worn-out horses and cripples.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee this question: By October 1 it is proposed to have the Army reduced to 322,000 or 323,000 men. This estimate was based originally on an Army of 509,000 men, but we can not use horses except on the basis of an Army of 322,000 men or an Army of less than that. There is no reason for basing this estimate on an Army of 400,000 men, because we know that by the time we buy these horses we will not have an Army of that size, and the result will be that we will overstock ourselves with horses, even assuming that 83,000 are not now on hand; but there are 83,000 on hand, or will be on the 1st of July, which will be an ample number for an Army of 322,000 men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate any longer about this matter, but 83,000 horses will not be ample for an Army of 322,000 men. The situation is this: The department asked for \$10,000,000 for horses for an Army of 500,000 men. We cut it squarely in two, to make them "get down to hard scrapple," to compel them to buy horses just as cheaply as possible, and buy just as few as possible, and, incidentally, to take as good care of them as possible, so as to prolong their lives. Now, if we should reduce the appropriation below \$5,000,000, it is easily to be seen that there will not be enough horses, and the department will come here with a deficiency item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Eighty-three thousand horses for an army of 322,000 men would mean a horse for every fourth man. As I understand the organization of the Army, it does not require a horse for every fourth man in the Army. I am quite sure the Senator must be mistaken about that.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator forgets that mules are included in this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am including the mules.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It takes 7,000 animals to provide for one division of Infantry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can advise us of any reason put forth by the House or by the committee of the House for fixing the figure originally at \$1,000,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; I can not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Chair hold that the yeas and nays have not been granted? I asked for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee asks for the yeas and nays. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. KIRBY and Mr. WADSWORTH demanded a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs that was passed over was, on page 48, line 20, in the total for

barracks and quarters, to strike out "\$2,000,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "\$18,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York has made an explanation with regard to this item I shall not ask him to do so again; but if he did I was not in the Chamber when the explanation was tendered. It does seem to me that with the large number of buildings that have been constructed during the war, with the large number of cantonments and other posts and places for the housing of the Army there ought to be sufficient quarters now without expending this large sum for the purposes indicated in this paragraph. It seems that a jump from \$2,000,000 to \$18,000,000 is entirely too much in view of the apparent lack of necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to be so much of an objector, but I wish to read this amendment, or parts of it. It is for barracks and quarters. If the American Army has not got barracks and quarters enough now, there never will be a time when we will not be called upon to spend enormous amounts of money for barracks and quarters. This provision reads:

For barracks, quarters, stables, storehouses, magazines, administration and office buildings, sheds, shops, and other buildings necessary for the shelter of troops, public animals, and stores, and for administration purposes, except those pertaining to the Coast Artillery—

Surely we do not want to authorize the construction of these buildings for the purposes indicated. We have spent hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars for cantonments and quarters for men and horses. We surely do not need any additional ones, and yet we are raising the House appropriation of \$2,000,000 to \$18,000,000, in part for such purposes as I have indicated. I read further from this provision:

for construction of reclamation plants; for constructing and repairing public buildings at military posts; for hire of employees—

We have just passed an immense appropriation for the hiring of employees; we have already provided for the hiring and pay of 101,000 civilian employees. But I proceed—

for rental of the authorized allowance of quarters for officers, including members of the Officers' Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty, on duty with the troops at posts and stations where no public quarters are available; of barracks or authorized allowance of quarters for non-commissioned officers and enlisted men on duty where public quarters are not available, including enlisted men of the Regular Army Reserve, retired enlisted men, and members of the enlisted Reserve Corps when ordered to active duty.

Every line that I have read up to date in this provision is for war purposes. Now listen to this. We are appropriating \$18,000,000 now, or it is proposed to do so, for what purpose? For ground for cantonments. Is it possible that we have not enough cantonments in this country for an Army of 322,000 men, when we have had enough during the past year for an Army of 3,700,000? Is it possible that we will permit this amendment to go through for such a purpose? Are we going to spend the public money in any such way as this?

But listen; I have not finished:

For grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes; for the hire of recruiting stations and lodgings for recruits.

That we have already appropriated for.

Mr. President, I have read this proposed amendment for the purpose of showing that it is solely for war purposes. If we adopt this amendment, we are appropriating \$18,000,000 for these war purposes in time of peace.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. What was the testimony favoring this expenditure in the committee hearings?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have been unable to find the testimony that asks for it.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator is not influenced by the phenomenal success of his townsman, I believe, Sergt. York, in dispatching the enemy with what might be regarded as inadequate equipment?

Mr. McKELLAR. If we had a few more like my friend, Mr. York, of Tennessee, there would not be any Germans; but Mr. York has gone back to the peaceful pursuits of life, like the other soldiers ought to go after the war is over. We ought not to have such appropriations. These are appropriations purely for war purposes; and I want the Senate to know just exactly what they are voting for. They are voting for the purchase of camp sites, for the building of cantonments, and the building of all kinds of public buildings for war purposes. These are the purposes to which this money is to be applied.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. KING. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I should like to ask him if the evidence before either the Senate committee or the House committee does not show that there are cantonments now in excess of the needs of the Army?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator and to the Senate that we had cantonments that would properly house in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 men, and we are abandoning the cantonments and camps every day; and yet, under this provision in the bill, it is proposed to devote \$18,000,000 to the purposes I have read.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that the Government owned a large number of forts and military posts before we entered the war which would house and properly care for two or three hundred thousand soldiers?

Mr. McKELLAR. Quite a large number; I can not give the exact figures, but a very large number; and the idea of appropriating money for cantonments is to my mind absurd and ridiculous.

Mr. KING. I will ask the Senator if it is not rather incongruous to ask for money for cantonments under the head of barracks and quarters, in view of the fact that some pages in advance an appropriation is sought for the repair of cantonments?

Mr. McKELLAR. I can not say positively. My recollection about this provision is that it has appeared in the appropriation bills since the war began. It is a war provision; it is not a peace-time provision at all, and it has no place whatsoever in this bill. It could be all stricken out, and it ought to be all stricken out. For some reason the House left it at \$2,000,000, which is entirely too much. There ought not to be anything appropriated under this provision. It is a war-time provision, pure and simple, and not a peace-time provision; and yet the Senate committee has raised it to \$18,000,000.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the Senator if many of the items that seem to be embraced within the amendment now under consideration are not contained in the amendment commencing on page 26 and ending on page 34? That is to say, I desire to ask if, in the amendment covering so many pages, ample provision is not made for many of the items referred to in the amendment now under consideration?

Mr. McKELLAR. Apparently so. We have already appropriated money for the 101,000 civilian employees, and this provides for the hire of employees, and I think there is confusion existing here.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee if he will not consent to striking out, on line 24, page 47, the phrase "for hire of employees"?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; if you do that, you will have to keep soldiers in the service.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is in charge of the bill. He has made an investigation and feels that that phrase is necessary?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is one of the most important phrases in the entire paragraph.

Mr. ASHURST. The statement has just been made that in another part of the bill an appropriation has been made for the hire of employees.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under another department of the War Department; not under this one.

Mr. ASHURST. That is what I wanted to know—under another department; and this is to pay for the hire of the employees who are to care for and maintain and prepare these buildings? That explains why that phrase is there?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

The Senator from Tennessee has asserted with great emphasis that this is a war appropriation. I venture the assertion that his statement is inaccurate. This is a peace-time appropriation, resulting, however, from the building of great cantonments and quarters and barracks to house the troops during the war.

I want now to read from the testimony of Gen. Marshall, which will be found on page 197 of the Senate hearings. I read this because the Senator from Tennessee has laid emphasis on the assertion that this is for building camps and cantonments.

Mr. McKELLAR. It says so on its face.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; but the Senator has left the impression that all the \$18,000,000 is to be spent for building. Now, let us see what the truth is:

Gen. MARSHALL. Before considering the estimates submitted by the Construction Division I want first to firmly impress upon you that these items are not for new construction or for finishing camps or cantonments. The items in my estimate are for maintenance and operation for an Army for the coming fiscal year, which it has been estimated will average for the year 500,000. No new construction of any size or importance is contemplated.

I may add here that I have a list of the specific items of new construction that are called for in this estimate. I can put that list into the hearing, if you so desire. That is a list of the specific things that will be constructed, as now before the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it will be wise for you to put that in.

Then follows a list of items varying in amount, as I glance over it, from \$900 in one place up to \$108,000 in McIntosh, Tenn., for barracks buildings for troops that are living along the border and have had to live under canvas for three or four years. The total of new construction estimated for under this item is \$1,232,000. There are miscellaneous items. I see here a saddler shop, frame stables, insulated warehouse for ice, gasoline filling station, fireproof oil-storage house, varying amounts, types of that kind, corrals for horses, and so forth; not at all in the sense of building a new cantonment or building a new camp; miscellaneous new construction in existing camps.

Then he continues:

Gen. MARSHALL. Whereas in a year and a half the Construction Division built works totaling a cost of over a billion dollars, three times the cost of the Panama Canal, at a time when there was a shortage of labor and materials and a congestion of transportation facilities unparalleled in the world's history, the principal work of the division now is maintenance and operation of the roads, buildings, and public utilities such as light, heat, power, water, sewage disposal, etc., at 46 camps and cantonments, 51 hospitals, 66 border stations, 25 supply depots and terminals, and 171 regular military posts, a total of 359 military establishments.

This testimony was all at the disposal of the Senator from Tennessee. It is not for new construction, except in that comparatively small item. The estimate was for \$23,906,205, divided as follows: Maintenance, \$13,333,973; extraordinary repairs, \$7,208,500; purchase—that is, of materials to make the repairs—\$590,550; new construction, \$2,773,000.

Now, of course, the amount is staggering. The committee was staggered when confronted with this situation; but these Army posts, these hospitals, these storage warehouses, these great cantonments which the Government owns, must be kept in a state of repair or they will go to pieces, and in one or two years you will lose the entire estimate made by Gen. Marshall for maintenance. It is one of the aftermaths of this war. It is up to the Senate to decide. Are these buildings to be allowed to have their roofs go to pieces, the posts and foundations under them go to pieces, water pipes go to leaking and ruining them on the inside, or are they to be kept in reasonable repair?

Gen. Marshall asked for \$23,000,000 and the committee cut him down to \$18,000,000. I do not understand myself how the House arrived at the figure of \$2,000,000. If only \$2,000,000 is appropriated, I say with all solemnity that within two months they will be forced to come to us for a deficiency item or Government property worth hundreds of millions of dollars will commence to perish.

That is the situation that is confronting us. We have carved Gen. Marshall out of \$5,000,000 worth of this maintenance. He can not buy any new land. He can not build any new cantonments. He can not buy any new camp sites. He can not build any new camps. I am perfectly willing that the language which the Senator from Tennessee has emphasized, and which is the only language in the item that he has emphasized, shall be stricken from the paragraph. It is old language, inherited from former appropriation bills; but if you cut it down to \$2,000,000 you will destroy twenty times that amount in Government property.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will.

Mr. KING. The Senator indicated, as I recall his statement, that there were over 300 of these camps.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are 359 places where troops and officers and supplies are quartered or stored.

Mr. KING. Is it the purpose of the Government to make a sale of some of those camps and cantonments?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Eventually, when the storehouses are emptied. They are all chuck full now. Eventually the cantonments which the Government has purchased, or has gone far on the road toward completing—the purchase of the land under 16 of the National Army cantonments has been discussed already in the Senate. Those cantonments cost between \$10,000,000 and \$16,000,000 apiece, the buildings alone. The electric-lighting plants, the laundries, the water-supply systems, the sewage-disposal systems, all owned by the Government were put in at great cost, averaging, as I said, between ten and sixteen million dollars per cantonment. Now, you have got to keep that in repair; you have got to keep the water pressure on, whether the cantonment is occupied or not; you have got to keep the water pressure on in order to reduce the fire hazard. You have got to keep the electric-light plant going, so that the electric lights around the streets shall be burning at night, to reduce the fire hazard. You have got to do certain cleaning and repairing in all those buildings from time to time. That is largely taken care of under this item, which the committee, as I have already indicated, has reduced by \$5,000,000.

Mr. KING. Has not the War Department outlined some program which contemplates the early disposition of all of these camps and cantonments and buildings?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it has not outlined any program for the disposition of the 16 National Army cantonments, because the Congress as yet has outlined no program for a permanent reorganization of the Army.

Mr. KING. Do I understand that the War Department is proceeding upon the theory that there will be a retention by the Government of these 350-odd camps, cantonments, posts, and so forth, and is not adopting any program for the purpose of making a disposition of any of them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The War Department can not very well make a program for the disposition of all of the Army posts in the United States until it knows what the Congress is going to do with the Army in the way of permanent legislation. Would the Senator say that Fort Myer should be sold? That is one of them.

Mr. KING. I have not sufficient information to venture an opinion upon that point.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is it.

Mr. KING. But it seems to me that the committee, or the War Department, or some one charged with the responsibility, ought to formulate a plan and present it for consideration here, so that somebody may act intelligently. Certainly, the Congress can not escape liability, or excuse itself for nonaction, if it does not confer the authority upon the War Department to act; and the War Department, if it has not authority, ought to suggest to the Congress some policy which the Congress ought to adopt with reference to a disposition of the property.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I alluded to that question very briefly last night, about the permanent reorganization of the Army. I myself hope that within the next 8 or 10 months the Congress of the United States will pass permanent legislation reorganizing the Army of the United States, and establishing a definite and fixed military policy. I, for one, have opposed doing that up to this time because before that is done I should like the Congress of the United States to be properly informed as to what the best military policy of this country must be in the future; and I do not think we can get the last scrap of information to enable us to legislate on such a very important topic until the entire American Expeditionary Force comes home, and until we have a chance to talk to all of those officers, from Gen. Pershing down, who are capable of giving us information. I hope the time will shortly come when we will establish a military policy for the country; and when we do so, then we can tell what shall occur with the Army posts and the cantonments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we have just received the glad news from Europe that Germany after all her travail and suffering is going to sign the treaty of peace. With the treaty, together with the covenant, peace amongst the nations of the earth is about to come to America. If we can not go back to a peace basis in our expenditures, what is the particular use of peace at all?

The Senator tells me that we need so many millions of dollars to maintain certain things. What is the use of maintaining things that we do not need to maintain? What is the sense in keeping up all these cantonments and everything else on a war basis when we are going, as we hope to God we are, to a peace basis pretty soon? Have we fought the war merely for the purpose of keeping on a war basis or have we fought the war for the purpose of putting an end to war as far as we knew how and getting back to the old basis of the English-speaking race in Europe and here in America, when we confess ourselves unready for war but are willing at all times to meet it if ever it shall come with every nerve that we have. Even if there were no covenant of peace, even if there were no peace treaty, we would be as well prepared for war to-day as we were in 1917, and we were well enough prepared then to make America feared and to make Germany succumb. We have made it a principle of the race in the old country and here for all time in the past, and I hope for all time in the future, that we shall not constantly burden the people with taxes permanently in order to be ready for war whenever war should break out, but that when war should break out we would spur ourselves to the very utmost to meet it with the energy of a great people and the intensity of a great struggling folk called to the struggle by patriotism and by a love of liberty and by a love of civilization.

Why does the Senator talk to us about keeping up these cantonments? What is the necessity of keeping them up? I noticed a moment ago that the Senator made a very shrewd remark. The Government had made a lot of money by disposing of a lot of horses and mules. Any army that wants to be effec-

tive will be engaged all the time in selling horses and mules and buying more horses and mules. If an army has not sense enough to do that, they have not the sense of a one-mule farmer, because as the old mule or the old horse gives out you want to dispose of him and buy another one fit for the business. Why not do the same thing with the cantonments? What use have you for them? Are you going to keep this Nation upon a war footing?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator undoubtedly understands that the cantonments are now being used for the demobilization of the troops. They must be maintained in repair while that is being done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, Mr. President, I understand that for the temporary purpose of demobilization some of the cantonments must be maintained, perhaps most of them, but that is a mere temporary purpose, and there is no reason under the sun to take account of that affair as a permanent business. We certainly will not need them beyond six months, unless Germany defies the world again, and if she does we will need war emergency appropriations and 2,000,000 men in the field. If Germany does not defy the world again, we will need about a quarter of a million men.

Mr. President, I believe that as an end of this great gigantic struggle we ought to agree that no country in the world shall keep more than a quarter million of men under the standard ready for war. The smallest nation, like Switzerland or Belgium, could do that; Serbia could do it. That would keep the strongest nation from overrushing them over night, murdering them while they were asleep, as Germany did Belgium.

If I thought that we had fought this war for the purpose of keeping America upon a basis of compulsory military service and upon a war basis, I would almost regret that we had ever entered into it at all. We fought this war to end war as well as we knew how. America's chivalry went to France for the purpose of saying to Germany you can not overrun Belgium and overrun France just because they are weaker than you are. We stand here in our might which we propose to make God's right, and we made it God's right because it was His right before we started in. It was the right of civilization and of peace and of harmony and of world accord. We made it all that because after all right can not be supported except by some sort of might somewhere, and we supported it. Why should we not quit this foolishness since it is over? We can understand fully why you are bound to lose money on horses and mules, selling old ones and buying new ones, but I can not understand for the life of me why we should keep on forever losing money on cantonments that are unnecessary for any warlike purpose.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, as I understand the situation there are 16 cantonments valued at \$209,000,000. There are necessary repairs to keep them in shape. Many of these cantonments are now occupied. The estimate for extraordinary repairs was \$14,000,000. The War Department cut it in half and made it \$7,000,000. Let me state what are the repairs: I think there are 570,000 linear feet of roofing to replace damaged roofing. There are concrete posts under many of the buildings. Many of the camps were built hastily and the wooden posts have rotted out. There are screens for the cantonments that are now occupied by the soldiers. There are other repairs, repairs to the water systems and the fire department. Seven million dollars is 3½ per cent of \$200,000,000, and it seems reasonable if these camps are to be kept in order that that expenditure should be made. Possibly they may be utilized even with an Army of 250,000 men.

The problem before the committee was, Shall we make the expenditure and save these cantonments and keep them in order, or shall we allow them to become wrecks and get rid of those wrecks at practically 5 or 6 per cent of their original cost? The National Guard encampments, of which there were, I think, 17, cost \$16,000,000. Of course, they did not have these large buildings; only the headquarters were permanent buildings. They were practically tents and flooring, but there were \$16,000,000 worth of National Guard camps that were sold for \$509,000. Those were wrecks, and that is what the War Department recovered.

I agree with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that we will not need all these cantonments, but we will need a certain number. We can dispose of them, however, better if we keep them in repair temporarily until we or the War Department determines what the policy shall be. It is impossible for them to declare a policy at this time. They have demobilized 2,500,000 men from these cantonments. Many of them are now occupied, and while they are engaged in the burden of

demobilizing this great Army, it is impossible for them to determine what the future policy is going to be and how large an Army we shall have.

So the question before the committee and the question before the Senate is, Are you willing to pay 3½ per cent to repair these cantonments so that they will be in better shape for sale or for disposal?

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator and I are both plain farmers, or at least I am. Suppose I built a barn that I did not need. Suppose I put up a cotton warehouse that I had no use for. Would I go to the foolish expense of keeping it in repair forever rather than cast it into the scrap heap? Suppose I was a manufacturer and that my machinery was out of date and new machinery was taking its place, what would I wisely do with the old machinery itself? I would put it in the scrap heap and sell it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. We will take the barn first.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Take both.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you were going to sell the barn, you would see that the roof was kept on it, so that you could sell it as a barn.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would see that it was torn down and the lumber was sold upon the market; but I would see that the roof was taken off with the shingles, as well as the sideboards, before I would sell it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Would you take the roof off before you took the hay out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I think I would take it all down at the same time, like the "deacon's one-horse shay"; but I would sell it and I would not be foolish enough to keep the fool thing there forever.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, as has been stated a number of times, when the full committee acted upon this bill the testimony taken before the subcommittee was not then available. It has only been available since this morning.

With reference to this item, it appears from the testimony that this maintenance item of some \$12,000,000 is composed of two items—in round numbers, \$3,000,000 for the pay of civilian employees and the balance for maintenance or upkeep of all of the cantonments and Army posts in the country.

The War Department acted very properly. In my judgment, in making these estimates, because the War Department could not assume the abandonment of any one of them. What is to be done in that respect will be for Congress to determine. But this item of \$10,000,000 for maintenance contemplates keeping up throughout the entire year every one of the 359 cantonments. I understand one-half of them are to be maintained for occupancy; the other half to be maintained, but not for occupancy. It ought to be assumed that Congress is not going to permit this year to go by without either determining or authorizing the War Department to determine upon the abandonment of at least one-half of these camps.

Mr. KING. Two-thirds.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Utah says two-thirds. Yes; two-thirds. The abandonment of two-thirds of these camps will yet suffice for the largest possible Army that a permanent military policy will require when adopted by Congress.

It is true that we must assume until the 1st of September that the present occupancy must continue until demobilization is completed, but by that time either Congress ought to determine upon the abandonment of a large number of these camps or instruct the War Department to do so; and if that is true, not more than one-half probably of the estimate for maintenance will be required.

I desire to move to amend the committee amendment in line 20 by striking out "\$18,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000." I am sure that that will be ample for maintaining these camps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment, on page 48, line 20, strike out "\$18,000,000" and in lieu insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I shall not object to that amendment, as I can see the temper of the Senate on this matter. I only hope it does not have this effect, a thing about which I am deeply concerned: A very considerable proportion of this estimate, which we have already cut \$5,000,000, is for pay of civilian employees who do the repairing at the cantonments and Army posts. They have taken on an increasing number of those men in order to let drafted soldiers out of the Army. I do not want those drafted men kept in the Army to do the work of maintaining these places in repair. One of the largest items that the construction division has to contend

with is the matter of pay of civilian employees to take the places of soldiers. I believe the Senate wants the soldiers discharged. I am going to consent to this reduction to \$15,000,000; but if it is shown later, after this bill becomes a law, that as a result of it soldiers are being kept in the service in order to reduce this expenditure by the War Department, I shall join, for I think I shall not be alone, in asking that a deficiency item be appropriated in order to take care of this work.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to state that the full estimate of the department for civilian employees to keep up these cantonments is \$3,000,000. I meant to say, which I omitted to say, that the committee in reporting the bill at the last session, which was not reached, proposed only \$14,000,000 where the committee now proposes \$18,000,000 and where my amendment will leave it at \$15,000,000.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is fair to say that when the committee reported it at the last session the War Department had not purchased the cantonment sites. I find myself here defending this administration under constant attack by Senators upon the other side of the Chamber. The committee did not buy these cantonments. The War Department has proceeded to purchase the land. The committee is faced with the proposal whether or not we shall allow the buildings on the land to go to pieces altogether. We did not even make the estimates.

The department, having acquired the property under this administration without consulting the Congress and under emergency appropriations made during the war, comes now to us and says, "Having acquired this property you do not want us to let it go to pieces, do you?" And the Committee on Military Affairs said, "No; we do not." That is the only responsibility we have in this matter. We did not acquire this property. We did not put up these buildings. But we do think that the property having been acquired, the buildings having been put up by the taxpayers of the United States, they should be maintained in a state of repair until, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, they can be sold. That is the only thought in the minds of this committee. I accept the reduction suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield for just a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand, but does the Senator think if a camp is to be abandoned and is not occupied, it will sell for one dollar more because it is maintained and kept in repair?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will certainly sell for more than if it were burned down by fire.

Mr. LENROOT. Oh, certainly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin I will say that I understand that a large number of these buildings are being used for storage purposes—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Many of them are being so used.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And that it is absolutely necessary to repair the roofs and to put concrete posts under them. If I remember correctly, the estimate of the War Department was \$31,000,000, and the House, I think, gave them \$23,000,000.

Mr. LENROOT. It gave them \$2,000,000. They asked for \$23,000,000, but your committee—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. They asked for \$23,000,000 and we gave them \$18,000,000. In the last Congress, when we gave them \$14,000,000, I hardly think the survey and inspection of the cantonments had been made and an estimate made for their repair. Therefore when they found it was necessary to repair these buildings, which were temporary, they made that estimate for the repairs and included it in the bill in these estimates. The estimates were \$14,000,000 and the estimates were cut right in half and appropriation was made of \$7,000,000 for repairs.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I say just this much, rather in support of the chairman of the committee, on this question of the cantonments? These cantonments had to be had; we needed them at the time. We had to put buildings on them; we had to put water there; we had to put lights there; we had to build streets and roads. That was a necessary expense, to which we had to go in order to train our men and properly equip them for the war.

Many of these buildings are valuable buildings; they are large and well constructed, and they have expensive and some of the very best material in them.

Now, it is a question whether we are going to let them go to waste, and besides the expense of removing them, which in itself would cost more than would be required to pay for the land and get an absolute title to it. We have either got to remove these buildings and put the property back in the same condition in which it was before the cantonments were estab-

lished there, which would be an enormous expense to the Government, or we must go on and complete the ownership of the property and keep it up until we can dispose of it. In some instances rent of the property would be more than it would be necessary to pay in order to buy it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?
Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator will remember that only yesterday we had before us the proposition of the acquirement of the Curtiss plant at Buffalo, where the buildings erected by the Government were appraised at 7½ per cent of their cost, while these estimates for maintenance amount to 6½ per cent a year—within 1 per cent of what the Government buildings were appraised for at Buffalo for the entire plant.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, that depends a great deal upon the character of the building. I can understand as to an aviation plant, for instance, that the buildings may be pure shells, with nothing complete about them to make them fit to be occupied. They may be only fit to be used for a certain purpose, frames merely, with a roof over them. In such cases, of course, the value is almost nothing, because the expense of tearing them down and taking them away would consume the entire value of the building. In such an instance 7½ per cent might be enough. There are, however, instances where these buildings are substantial buildings which can be utilized and the property sold off in lots. Often the cantonments are conveniently located to a town and have communication with a city, with good roads leading to them, and the property can be maintained and eventually the Government may reimburse itself very largely for its expenditure.

I want to say further that it is a mistake, in my judgment, for Senators to assume here with reference to these various items that the representatives of the War Department either do not comprehend what they need or else that they are purposely misleading the committee. That is unfair. Those men do know what they want, and they know absolutely what the necessities are. We ought, at least, to give them credit for good faith. Do not assume here upon every item that comes up that the representatives of the Government are attempting in some way or other to put their hands into the Treasury and get something that ought not to be taken from the Treasury.

Then, in the next place, it is a mistake to assume that the committee does not understand these items and has not given careful attention to the statements with reference to every one of them and due consideration of the merits of each one of them. The subcommittee which was appointed on this bill worked day and night, they worked laboriously and earnestly, and went through every word and every letter and every item of this bill. They know what they have recommended here and why they have recommended it. After the subcommittee finished the bill they reported it to the full committee, and the full committee sat day and night and went over every item of the bill. It is not proper, therefore, to assume here that these items are offered simply offhand, without full comprehension of their meaning and of the merits back of them. These items have been looked into by the committee, who know perfectly well what they mean and why they are here, and they are recommended by the committee upon their merits.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am through.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Florida a question. Of course the Senator understands that the War Department, as a department, have made no recommendation about these cantonments; they have offered no policy about them. So far as the department has done anything at all, it is merely preserving the status quo. As a matter of fact, it is not the duty of the department to outline a policy. It is the duty of Congress to outline a policy. Of course, if we desire a recommendation from the Secretary of War, I have no doubt he will give it; but the discussion of these items is not any criticism of the Secretary of War, for he has made no recommendation in reference to the subject at all.

Mr. FLETCHER. As to any policy relative to this matter, Mr. President, we have all agreed, and we perfectly understand, that we are not now in a position to fix a definite policy with reference to the Military Establishment of the country for the future.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Therefore the matter is entirely open.

Mr. FLETCHER. The only thing we can do now is to take care of the present situation, at least until matters clear up and until we can better judge of what our permanent policy should be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McKELLAR. Making the appropriation \$15,000,000 instead of \$18,000,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood the chairman of the committee was willing to accept the amendment, and nobody raised any objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated I would accept it, and I expressed my feelings on the subject. I stated I would accept the reduction, but I have no authority to do so for the committee or for the Senate. It is but fair to say that some of my colleagues on the committee, who have studied this matter exceedingly hard, disagree with me in my acceptance of this reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to offer an amendment perfecting the provision for which \$15,000,000 is now appropriated. I move to strike out on page 48—and I think the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment—in lines 8, 9, 10, and 11, the words "for grounds for cantonments, camp sites, and other military purposes, and for buildings or portions of buildings for occupation by troops, for use as stables, storehouses, and offices, and for other military purposes."

I think those words should go out, and I move to strike them out.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think they ought to go out.

Mr. LENROOT. I think the pending amendment should be disposed of before the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be; I do not know the parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point made by the Senator from Wisconsin is well taken. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended on motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, I move to strike out the language to which I have referred, and I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; the chairman of the committee can not accept the amendment in that form. I call the attention of the Presiding Officer to the fact that we are proceeding with the consideration of the bill under an order that committee amendments shall first be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to hold that, according to the agreement under which the Senate is now operating, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is not at this time in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I will offer it later.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 53, in the item under the subhead "Rifle ranges for civilian instruction," in line 15, to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$100,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 64, line 11, in the total for ordnance stores and ammunition, to strike out "\$200,000" and to insert "\$1,600,000."

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, that is the amendment to which I called attention yesterday. The War Department has recommended \$150,000 for this purpose. We have on hand already 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition of this kind. This plant or factory, if it is continued to be operated at its full capacity, will make 250,000 rounds of this kind of ammunition every day. Having as much ammunition of the kind on hand as we do have, why should we spend \$1,600,000 a year manufacturing ammunition that can not possibly be used?

Here is a place where we could exercise some sound discretion and save the Government a little money. Why should we have 250,000 rounds of ammunition manufactured daily when we have on hand 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition, which could not be shot in a whole year with 4,000,000 on the field of battle? The War Department only recommended \$150,000. The House made an appropriation of \$200,000, and I do not believe we ought to increase it to \$1,600,000 under the circumstances I have mentioned.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know why it was raised and at whose instance it was raised?

Mr. KIRBY. It was raised because they have an efficient corps of operatives at this particular factory, and a great many of them would necessarily be required to seek employment at some other place if we should not continue to operate the factory at full capacity. That is the only reason for the increase of this appropriation, as I understand.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KNOX. I thought the Senator had concluded.

Mr. KIRBY. I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, as the matter has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas it looks as if there were scarcely an answer to his statement, but I think there is. We have got to look at this matter in a very much broader way than it has been presented by the Senator from Arkansas.

The War Department estimated some \$3,300,000 for this item, and last spring the committee, in the bill which was not brought before the Senate or was not passed, recommended \$2,000,000 for this item. The Frankford Arsenal is one of the unique institutions of this country. It is one of the oldest establishments or instrumentalities in our national defense. It was founded more than 100 years ago and has been the nucleus from which all the arsenals of the country, both permanent and temporary, have sprung. There is a settlement of working men and women residing at Frankford whose fathers and grandfathers worked there before them and who have acquired their own homes. They are an institution. During this war it was from the Frankford Arsenal that the trained and skilled mechanics were sent into the new munitions factories of the country that enabled us to turn out the enormous amount of ammunition which was sent abroad to carry on the war.

Mr. President, we were told in the committee that the \$200,000 recommended by the House was upon the theory that these men should be dismissed, that that settlement should be broken up, and that nucleus of fine mechanics upon which the country can draw in the future should be dispersed. The testimony before the committee showed that 90 per cent of these people were American-born citizens and that the great majority of them own their own homes.

I think, Mr. President, that we all recognize that these great institutions and instrumentalities of war are not profit-making concerns. We build battleships that never engage in naval conflict; we build great guns that never fire a shot at an enemy; we manufacture powder that deteriorates and is never utilized. This institution, like every other worthy, well-established institution, is supported, as I say this one is, by American mechanics, who have constituted a great nucleus, is practically a college of technical men and technical women, and ought to be maintained.

The War Department, as I have stated, estimated for over \$3,000,000. We are not asking that this institution should be maintained at its full capacity, where they can employ some 2,400 men. We have put this at \$1,600,000, which was the peace basis upon which it stood before war was declared. I hope the amendment of the committee will prevail.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Can the Senator indicate the amount of the appropriations for this institution from year to year, say, during the 10 years preceding our entrance into the war?

Mr. KNOX. Immediately preceding the war it was about \$1,600,000. The committee had agreed to allow \$2,000,000, but the Senator from Indiana [Mr. New] asked the question of one of the foremen of the arsenal, and he said that immediately preceding the war the appropriation was about \$1,600,000. Furthermore, I have a letter here, which I think I ought to read, as indicating the uses of the munitions that are manufactured there. There are many uses for small-arms ammunition. The letter has reference to the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas last evening, and is as follows:

COMMITTEE OF EMPLOYEES,
FRANKFORD ARSENAL,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1919.

Hon. PHILANDER C. KNOX.

DEAR SENATOR: When the Army appropriation bill was being considered in the Senate last night Senator Kirby made a statement that he understood that the appropriation of \$1,600,000 recommended by the Senate committee would keep Frankford Arsenal running at its full capacity of 250,000 cartridges per day. This would amount to 75,000,000 cartridges in the year.

Senator Kirby is under the wrong impression in this matter. The cost of cartridges during the war was \$47.60 per thousand, but on account of the reduction of the hours of work to eight per day, doing away with overtime and night work, has probably reduced the cost to about \$40 per thousand. If we were to produce 250,000 cartridges per day, or a total of 75,000,000 (300 days at 250,000 per day), it would require an appropriation of \$3,000,000.

Of the appropriation of \$1,600,000 recommended, at least \$400,000 will be used on experimental work in developing the new 50-caliber antitank gun cartridge and new gallery practice cartridge, incendiary and armor-piercing cartridges. About \$50,000 will be used for burials at the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, for firing the morning and evening guns at military post, etc. This leaves available for straight manufacture of small-arm cartridges \$1,150,000. This amount would enable us to produce 28,750,000 cartridges in the year, or 96,000 cartridges per day, or a little more than one-third of our capacity.

A production of 96,000 cartridges per day will only permit us to a bare skeleton organization. We will have to reduce our force greatly, while the appropriation of \$200,000 will wipe it out entirely.

I understand that the War Department's program calls for the firing of 223,000 rounds per year in target practice, and if we only manufacture 28,750,000 there will be a reduction of the amount on hand of 194,000,000 rounds per year, and it would only be about three years until the amount of cartridges on hand would be reduced to the minimum reserve desired, and then we would have to greatly increase our force and produce each year an amount to equal the amount fired by the Army, or 223,000,000 rounds per year.

COMMITTEE.

This letter was written to me by the superintendent of the arsenal.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, may I ask a question? Is it the idea to establish this plant as a permanency, or just to take care of the plant and its business for a year?

Mr. KNOX. It was established as a permanency over 100 years ago. The question now is as to whether we will abandon it.

Mr. TRAMMELL. The question is whether the Government will continue to assist in maintaining this plant?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRAMMELL. And the War Department did not recommend an appropriation exceeding \$150,000 per annum.

Mr. KNOX. The War Department recommended an appropriation of over \$3,000,000.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I did not so understand from the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], who made a statement with regard to it.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I should like to have the chairman of the committee make the statement that he made to the committee the other evening on this proposition, about the \$150,000 that the War Department suggested.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I regret that I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. KIRBY. I understood the chairman of the committee to say the other evening, in the committee, that the \$150,000 had been thought sufficient by the War Department; that it had not recommended the \$2,000,000; that the House had left it at \$200,000; and that we had 1,700,000,000 rounds of ammunition already on hand.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Chief of Ordnance, Gen. Williams, appeared before the committee, and, in going over the ordnance items—which at that time in the House bill provided for \$200,000 under this heading—stated that he would not ask an increase over the \$200,000, so that the committee left it at that amount for the time being. Then this matter of the total abandonment of cartridge manufacture at the Frankford Arsenal was brought to our attention by the superintendent of the plant, and I took the liberty of calling Gen. Williams on the telephone and asking him what the effect would be of limiting the appropriation to \$200,000, and he said it would result in the discharge of most of the workmen; that they had been reduced at the present time to something like 600 men, which was the peace-time strength; that it would take \$2,000,000 to support 600 men in the arsenal and keep them at work. The committee in full session, with a large percentage of the members present, reconsidered the matter of the \$200,000 appropriation, and agreed to make it \$1,600,000 in order to keep these workmen together. The last peace-time appropriation was \$2,000,000. We reduced it again to \$1,600,000. That will not keep 600 men, the original peace-time strength. It will reduce the force to something like 400 men, or perhaps 500.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question? Has this establishment been owned and maintained by the Government for the 100 years indicated by the Senator?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has. It is the original cartridge factory of the Government.

Mr. KING. And what was the appropriation for, say, the 10 years preceding the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not the figures in my mind; but the peace-time appropriation for several years before our entrance into the war with Germany averaged something between \$1,500,000 and \$2,000,000 annually.

Mr. KING. Will not the cessation of the war and the proclamation of peace call for a reduction in the force in many of the arsenals and Government plants devoted to war purposes?

Mr. WADSWORTH. This figure of \$1,600,000 represents a reduction of \$400,000 from the appropriation of 1916. It is merely a question of policy, Senators. It can be contended that

we do not actually need the cartridges that will be turned out by these four or five hundred men; but do we need those men, or, rather, will we need them at some future period? The committee decided to keep the men together, or this little nucleus.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, when this matter was brought to the attention of the committee it recalled to my mind the fact that the workmen of the Frankford Arsenal are men of family, with homes of their own, a fact which had not been brought to my attention some years ago in connection with an amendment to an Army bill which has since then been in all Army bills, and which the Senate voted to retain in this one to-day. The fact is that it is one of the few remaining old-fashioned institutions in America around which a settled and typical American community have gathered and grown, and passed their lives, and transmitted their calling to their children. We have altogether too few of such communities in modern America; and the few that we retain should be preserved, in my judgment, even though it requires an appropriation of money too large for the immediate needs of the work of that community at a given time.

The Frankford Arsenal is one of the old, standard institutions of our Military Establishment. This war has demonstrated the tremendous importance of such a community and brought home to us its value, its almost priceless value, in times of crisis, because had not it been for this and one or two similar typical communities we would have been hard put to it for skilled workmen for the construction of the munitions so sorely needed. From Frankford Arsenal came the men whom the Government distributed to other similar institutions coming into existence with the crisis of the war, whose skill and experience were transmitted to other workmen, thereby enabling them to serve the country in its hour of need, with the result that when the war came to a close we were able—and it was a comparatively short time after we had entered the war—to supply an expeditionary force of 2,000,000, and for training purposes a force almost as large within our own country, and supply them with small arms and with munitions. It is possible that we might have solved this tremendous problem notwithstanding and in the absence of communities like this, but it certainly would have required a longer time, and the intricacies of the problem would have been measurably increased.

The problem, to my mind, is this: Shall we make a larger appropriation than is absolutely essential for the needs of Frankford Arsenal, and preserve that community of homes, that assemblage of workmen skilled in arts that are peculiarly essential in times of war, or shall we permit it virtually to disappear, the workmen being compelled to seek elsewhere the needed employment for taking care of themselves and their families, or shall we continue a policy which has been demonstrated to be so valuable?

One of the sinister tendencies of modern times is the decreasing influence of family life; the tendency of workmen, and particularly in the crowded communities, to remain in one place for a comparatively short time, and then go to some other place; to become wanderers, so to speak; to have no fixed anchorage in the soil; and, of course, that means a tendency to avoid the responsibilities and the cares and the struggles of wedded life. It weakens the hold of the family tie upon the younger generation. I believe that many of our troubles are due to that fact. I believe that if the old-fashioned discipline of the old-fashioned family were enforced against the younger generation, instead of permitting them to grow up comparatively without restraint, there would be less of socialism and anarchy and Bolshevism in the United States.

I believe we should encourage, so far as possible, the permanence and continuation of typical American communities of middle-class workmen, skilled in their arts, like that which so distinguishes Frankford, Pa.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, the specious argument and the special pleading by the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Pennsylvania confirm the opinion that there is no necessity whatever for this appropriation beyond \$200,000, the amount that the Chief of Ordnance said was all that was necessary.

It seems to me such a peculiar idea that we should, at the expense of the Government, maintain 600 families yonder in Pennsylvania, when the product made by the work of these men is not necessary. Would the Senator insist that the church house is built for the preacher? Would he insist that the courthouse is built for the judge? Would he insist that the Capitol is built for the President? Would he insist that the arsenal was built to give 600 men employment? No; it was built for the benefit of the Government, and to supply a need that was thought to exist.

The Senator says that family life ought to be encouraged. That is probably true. Is the Senator able to tell us whether the

men and their families around this arsenal have more children to the family than they have anywhere else in the United States; that the Government is being benefited in that way?

Here is a plain, straight up-and-down proposition. The Chief of Ordnance says that he does not need more than \$200,000 for the Frankford Arsenal. The Chief of Ordnance says that the reason why he does not need any more than \$200,000 is that the war is practically over, and there are 1,700,000,000 rounds of this kind of ammunition on hand. Ammunition deteriorates. In four or five years it is worthless. This ammunition could not possibly be used up, if the 4,000,000 men in the Army were on the battle field and fighting, in a whole year.

Now, why should we waste the material that will be put into this other fixed ammunition and manufactured in order to give 600 families employment of this kind? It ought not to be done. If they are such experts that the Government must have their services, let them be commissioned and put into the service and maintained as experts upon a salary. That would be the reasonable way to proceed about it. This fourteen hundred thousand dollars ought not to be expended here under these conditions.

I insist that the amendment be not adopted and that the amount be left standing at \$200,000, which will be sufficient to meet the needs of the Government.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, only one word more. I do not want the Senate to be under the impression that the War Department has made any such representation as that the arsenal can be maintained on an appropriation of \$200,000. An appropriation of \$200,000 contemplates the disbanding of that entire organization, and is only the amount that will take care of the buildings and keep the watchmen about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the committee.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over, and the last amendment of the committee passed over, is on page 65, line 5, under the heading "Manufacture of arms":

For manufacturing, repairing, procuring, and issuing arms at the national armories.

In line 5 the committee propose to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, last night I assured the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that I would communicate with the Ordnance Department to ascertain from them what the effect of this reduction would be upon the arsenals which manufacture the Springfield rifle. I have here a letter addressed to me by Gen. C. C. Williams, the Chief of Ordnance. I think perhaps the quickest way is to ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the communication.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ORDNANCE,
June 24, 1919.

Hon. JAMES L. WADSWORTH,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Subject: Appropriation, "Manufacture of arms." 1. Referring to the reduction of the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000, the following is submitted:

In accordance with the present program, the only rifle which will be in the hands of troops during peace time, or which will be in active use in connection with training activities, will be the United States rifle, model of 1903 (Springfield rifle). Including the number of these rifles on hand at the beginning of the war there have been manufactured to date a total of 1,020,425. A large number of these rifles were sent to France and were used in combat and in the intensive training of troops. It is estimated that of the total number manufactured there remains approximately 800,000. In order to equip an army of 500,000 men there will be required approximately 350,000 rifles, which includes a small allowance for the National Guard. It is estimated that there will be issued 100,000 of these rifles to civilian rifle clubs, 75,000 to the Marine Corps, and 50,000 to the Navy. This makes a total of 575,000 Springfield rifles to be issued, leaving approximately 225,000 to cover the number of rifles in shipment, in storage, undergoing repairs, etc. The maximum life of one of these rifles under the conditions obtained in time of peace is less than 10 years. If it is assumed that the life of the rifle is 10 years, and the number now available (800,000) is maintained intact, it will be seen that one-tenth of the rifles in actual service (575,000) should be replaced annually. In other words, it is believed that provision should be made for the manufacture of 57,500 rifles each year, or an average of 192 rifles per day.

If the authorized strength of the peace Army is reduced below 500,000, there will be, of course, a corresponding reduction in the number of rifles required for the peace Army.

In addition to producing rifles in order to replace those worn out in service, it is thought that another and vastly more important reason for continuing the manufacture of this arm on a small scale is to enable the Government to keep together a small organization which is capable of being expanded in case of emergency in order to provide for the increased production of rifles which will then be demanded and in order to keep alive the art of making this type of military weapon. For this purpose it is considered that the production should be 100 rifles per day of eight hours.

Springfield Armory is now working on orders placed during the war, and there remains undelivered on these orders approximately 100,000 rifles. The funds for the completion of these rifles remain available until July 1, 1920, and it is proposed to continue Springfield Armory at its present rate of production (300 rifles per day) with those funds until that date. Inasmuch as the funds granted under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" continues for two years, such money as becomes available under the bill at present under consideration will be available until July 1, 1921, and if the amount is great enough it is proposed to use it in experimental work during the year 1919-20 and for the continuing of the manufacture at Springfield Armory during 1920 and 1921.

It is the firm opinion of this department that the minimum manufacturing program which should be considered for Springfield Armory is 100 rifles per day of eight hours. The price of the Springfield rifle under existing conditions is approximately \$30, and in order to continue the manufacture of the Springfield rifle for a year (300 days), \$900,000 will therefore be required. If \$1,000,000 be granted under the present bill and \$900,000 be spent in the manufacture of rifles at the rate of 100 per day, there will remain \$100,000 available for all experimental work on rifles and appendages thereof, and for maintenance and repair and the expense incident to the issue of these weapons. It is believed, however, that \$1,000,000 will enable the Ordnance Department to institute a fairly satisfactory program relative to small arms.

In case only \$500,000 is appropriated under the appropriation, the number of rifles which it will be permissible to manufacture per day will be too small to economically produce, and will not enable us to maintain what is considered to be the minimum organization which should be maintained as a nucleus for future quantity production, should such production become necessary.

2. In view of the above it is urgently recommended that the question of increasing the amount under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 be given the most serious consideration.

Respectfully,
C. C. WILLIAMS,
Major General, United States Army,
Chief of Ordnance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if, in view of this letter, the action of the Senate just now upon the matter which we have voted upon, and the speeches made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], he is not willing to allow the amount, \$1,000,000, named by the House, to stand?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not feel authorized, of course, to reverse the action of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs by consenting to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Then all I want to say, Mr. President, is that while the Committee on Military Affairs have recommended an increase of 800 per cent against the recommendation of the Chief of Ordnance for the purpose of manufacturing ammunition, in the case of small arms they have on the contrary recommended a reduction of 50 per cent, notwithstanding that the Chief of Ordnance recommends that the amount should be \$1,000,000 instead of \$500,000, and notwithstanding the fact that two of the leading members of that committee have urged an increased appropriation in the case of the manufacture of ammunition because its reduction may drive men out of employment and destroy Government plants. I do not see how, if the Senate desires to be consistent, it can take any other position than to allow the amount named by the House to stand, namely, \$1,000,000.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I may not have clearly apprehended the meaning of the letter which has just been read, but as I interpret the letter it meant that there were available now under existing appropriations and under existing law sufficient sums to construct 100,000 rifles. So this appropriation would not be necessary because the appropriation heretofore made would run the arsenal at full capacity, and there is a contract, as I understand the letter, still outstanding which calls for one or two hundred rifles per day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Three hundred.

Mr. KING. Three hundred per day, the Senator from New York indicates.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator read the last paragraph of the letter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have it right here. The situation is somewhat different from that at the Frankford Arsenal. That portion of the letter reads as follows:

Springfield Armory is now working on orders placed before the war, and there remains undelivered on these orders approximately 100,000 rifles. The funds for the completion of these rifles remain available until July 1, 1920, and it is proposed to continue Springfield Armory at its present rate of production—300 rifles per day—with these funds until that date.

Mr. KING. That is, a year from now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; a year from now.

Inasmuch as the funds granted under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" continues for two years, such money as becomes available under the bill at present under consideration will be available until July 1, 1921.

Let me suggest to the Senator—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator please finish reading the sentence?

Mr. WADSWORTH (reading)—

And if the amount is great enough it is proposed to use it in experimental work during the year 1919-20.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask the Senator to read the last paragraph of the letter.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; the last paragraph, of course, recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000, but that is on the theory that the \$500,000 that is to be appropriated as suggested by the Military Committee will be the only appropriation available for the next two years. It is good for two years when appropriated under this heading.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator to read the last paragraph of the letter?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

In view of the above it is urgently recommended that the question of increasing the amount under the appropriation "Manufacture of arms" from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 be given the most serious consideration.

That is true.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. So the last paragraph calls attention to its being at least a serious matter to reduce the amount.

Mr. WADSWORTH. To a serious situation two years ahead and subsequent to July 1, 1920. There is no serious situation this coming year.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a letter which I have received containing the facts regarding the situation in the manufacture of small arms.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1919.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to an urgent appeal received at my office from the employees at the Springfield Armory, I take this opportunity of inviting your attention to the small appropriation contained in the pending Army appropriation bill for the production of small arms at the Springfield Armory.

At the present time there are employed at the Springfield Armory approximately 2,400 men. With this force, assuming the average cost of each rifle is \$30, the amount of \$1,000,000 carried in the bill will keep the force employed only four months of the year, unless two-thirds of these employees are to be thrown out of employment.

The item referred to is in the pending Army appropriation bill (H. R. 5227), on page 47, under the heading, "Manufacture of arms." This same item was \$2,500,000 in the Army appropriation act which failed to pass at the close of last Congress, both as it was passed from the House and as reported from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs (see H. R. 15835, pp. 54 and 48 of the two prints of the bill as referred to the Senate committee and as reported from that committee, respectively).

This item ought to at least be \$3,000,000 in order to maintain the present force which is below the prewar basis. However, if the \$2,500,000 contemplated to be appropriated for this purpose last Congress is restored, it may meet the situation.

Owing to the depreciation, as well as other wastes, which naturally will take place with our present national supply of small arms, it is felt that this supply should be replenished continuously in order to at least maintain a supply of rifles equal to that now existing. The Springfield Armory is the Government's principal small arms establishment and it is felt that every important article of warfare should be manufactured by the Government in such quantities as to retain an organization and force of workmen of sufficient size to meet any expansion which might be necessary in production in case of new hostilities arising.

Once the workmen are scattered around the country in other industries, it would be a difficult task to reassemble them for war production. This at least was the experience during the period of the war. It is also an unnecessary hardship to place upon workmen to require them to move about the country seeking employment and using up their meager savings if perchance this economy is only a temporary one.

Trusting it will be possible for you to secure the restoration of this appropriation, and assuring you that your efforts will be highly appreciated by the workmen concerned, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

M. P. ALIFAS,
President District No. 44,
International Association of Machinists.

The only sum requested is \$1,000,000, and an appropriation of \$1,000,000 means a very substantial reduction in the working force. The point I want to make is this: If the reason for increasing the appropriation in the last item was to avoid destroying Government plants, if it was to avoid driving out of employment the employees, if it was done in order not to scatter them away from their homes and their residences of years, the same argument applies to a plant in Springfield as much as it does to a plant in Pennsylvania, and there ought not to be any discrimination made if that is the policy. If they are going to close up these plants and drive these old and experienced employees out, well and good; but, Mr. President, in the manufacture of munitions let us not discriminate between plants located in one part of the country and those in another part of the country.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. With pleasure.

Mr. KING. I think if the argument of the Senator from Massachusetts were predicated on facts as they have been developed it would perhaps be invulnerable, but if the Senator will pardon me I will call attention again to the letter and to the interpretation which I place upon it. The appropriation which has been heretofore made and which has not been expended contemplates the operation of the factory now under discussion at its full capacity, to wit, the production of 300 arms per day during all of next year—that is, until the 30th day of June, 1920. The appropriation which is carried by this bill would be in addition to that, or at any rate it would not become available until the appropriation which is now in existence had been exhausted. The factory will continue to operate, producing 300 guns per day, and this \$500,000, if it were stricken from the bill entirely, would not affect the operation of the factory one particle. It would not call for the discharge of a single man between now and the 30th day of June, 1920.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If you can give me an assurance of that, I will drop this matter and not only not ask that \$1,000,000 be appropriated but not ask that even \$500,000 be appropriated. If you can assure me that that plant is going to operate the same as it has in the past and that every man will be employed, then we are wasting time in appropriating \$500,000.

Mr. KING. I think that is right, and I think the letter carries that assurance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I do not so interpret it. I take the statement of the Chief of Ordnance in the letter that it will be a serious matter should this amount be reduced from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000. Those are his very words. The House fixed the amount of \$1,000,000, and the Senate committee reduced it to \$500,000. When the House in the matter of appropriations for munitions appropriated \$200,000 the Senate committee increased it to \$1,000,000, and we have to-day had two members of the committee who have spoken in favor of the increase. I think we ought to have the same policy in regard to all these plants.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that the letter distinctly shows that the funds are at present available to keep this plant in operation until the 30th of next June? You do not need any further appropriation, because the appropriation has already been made and the funds set aside, and they are available for that purpose. I am not out of sympathy with the Senator's position, and I do not know but I shall vote in favor of his proposition, but eventually he is going to get this money. There is no question but that the plant is going to need it sometime, and if you want to get it in advance you can do it. That is really the only basis for the claim, however, because with what is now available and this \$500,000 you have money to keep the plant going for the full period with all its force.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. As a member of the committee, can the Senator inform me whether, having already appropriated \$500,000 that is not going to be used during the current year, there is enough money appropriated already to use for that factory? Do you make that assertion? If you do, why is there any money asked for here at all, if there is already money on hand and contracts made to keep every employee at work?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no reason for it unless you want to make contracts in advance or to do some work for experimental purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Why has the Chief of Ordnance made the request and told you it is a serious matter? I have information from the armory at Springfield as to what is going to happen—that there will not be work for four months for the 2,500 men employed in the armory if the amount asked, \$1,000,000, is not given but \$500,000 instead. It is a very serious matter. The thing I insist upon is the same policy regarding all these plants. I want the people in Springfield and the people in Pittsfield and the people in Pennsylvania and Ohio to know that the Senate is closing up all these factories and driving people out of employment; that we have enough munitions and small arms on hand; and not discriminate between factories located in different parts of the country, and have one policy in regard to ammunition and another policy in regard to small arms.

I do not know anything better to say on this matter than the speeches of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], who pointed out to us how their communities would be depleted of population if they did not have the appropriation raised from \$200,000 to \$1,600,000. I do not want to press the matter on personal grounds in any way. I am not interested in it, except to have a well-defined policy and purpose.

I do not want any discrimination. I do not want any favoritism. I do not want the Senate to lay itself open to the suggestion that whenever there happens to be a member of the committee from the section affected there is no difficulty about an increase in the amount, but in the case of localities from which no member of the committee has come a decrease is provided.

I repeat, the House has made this sum \$1,000,000. The committee on the part of the Senate has reduced it to \$500,000. In the matter of munitions, the House fixed the amount at \$200,000 and the Senate increased it to \$1,600,000, and there has been no satisfactory explanation.

I hope the Senate will vote down the committee amendment and allow the amount to stand as passed by the House.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee this question: What has become of all of the rifles that we procured to arm our soldiers with in this war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The letter read by the Secretary a few moments ago gives a very full account of the rifle situation. In general words, the situation is that we have about 3,000,000 rifles on hand, including the American Enfield that we started to manufacture after we went into the war, and the American Springfield. The American Springfield is regarded as the superior weapon, and in the future the active Army of the United States, I understand, is to be equipped with the American Springfield.

Mr. REED. There are 3,000,000?

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are about 1,000,000 American Springfield and 2,000,000 American Enfield, as I understand the letter which has been read into the Record. I may be a little inaccurate as to the general situation.

Mr. REED. The statement made by the chairman of the committee puts this question in a little different form than I had felt justified in assuming. One thing is absolutely certain, in my opinion, and that is that it is a policy of unwisdom for America ever to allow herself to be again confronted with a war without having on hand a gun to put into the hands of every soldier. This much can be said for a rifle, that, eliminating the question of obsolescence due to improved arms, a rifle can be put away and be as good 10 years after it is made as the day it is made. It costs very little to store it. I hope the day will never come when we will again find the recruits of an American Army drilling with broomsticks or guns whittled out of boards.

So far as I am concerned, I propose to vote whenever I have the opportunity for enough cannon so that if we have a war our soldiers will have cannon to protect them, and for enough rifles to put into the hands of American citizens to protect themselves, and for enough of that kind of ammunition that does not become useless with which to load these guns.

I am not prepared to say whether \$500,000 or \$1,000,000 is necessary in this instance. I do not believe in appropriating a dollar merely for the purpose of keeping plants running and labor employed, except that a Government plant ought to be run in a condition so that experts enough can be kept constantly on hand. I do not believe in voting this money to keep labor employed, because there is enough other work for labor in the country to keep it employed. It is utterly useless to deny that proposition. Some people are denying it; but if you wish to test it go out and try to hire 10 or a dozen men to work to-day in any part of this country. Even, however, if there were a shortage of labor, we would gain very little by taxing that part of labor which is employed in order to make something that is useless. The only excuse for employing labor is to employ it to produce something that is necessary.

Now, I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that it seems to me when the department asks for an appropriation and presents as its reason for it a desire to keep a plant running so that the experts can be kept there, so that they can make proper experiments, a thing vitally essential, I think we had better not pare the appropriation.

The thing that made Germany almost invincible and made her almost the conqueror of the world was the fact that she spent money in experiments. The man who believe that war will never come again to this world ought to be incarcerated in an asylum for the feeble-minded. It will come, and it will come all the quicker and all the surer to the nation that is unprepared.

This war has demonstrated that American soldiers can be put on the battle field very quickly and that the old theory that it took three years to make a soldier is not true, but it also has demonstrated the fact that the Nation that has arms of the latest and most improved pattern and has them stored away so that it can arm its citizens is in a good position to defend itself. I hope the United States will never again make war beyond her own borders, but if the United States ever has occasion to defend her borders I hope that the enemy making the

attack will be compelled to face batteries of cannon such as the world has never seen massed before and that she will find an entire population with guns in their hands. I do not believe it is wise to save \$500,000 in the manufacture of small arms.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Massachusetts desire a division?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I was in hope that the Senator from New York would agree that the amount should be retained as agreed to by the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have explained to the Senator from Massachusetts that I have not the authority to reverse the action of the committee in writing an item upward.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I think I heard the chairman accept some other similar suggestions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They were reductions.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. In view of the speeches of two of the members of the committee, who evidently have changed their views, I thought perhaps the Senator from New York might change his.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I really do not feel at liberty to do so. Does the Senator desire a division? My eye is on the clock. It is 11.25; this is the last committee amendment to this bill, and if we can dispose of it to-night then I think we can dispose of three or four individual amendments, copies of which I have already seen, and which I think I am justified in accepting on the part of the committee, pass the bill, and not bother the Senate again at this session.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask for a division.

On a division, there being a tie vote, the Chair declared the amendment lost.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understand that the committee amendment is lost.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote being a tie, the committee amendment is rejected, and the original million dollar appropriation stands. That is the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, a new paragraph, as follows:

That the office of General of the Armies of the United States is hereby revived, and the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to said office a general officer of the Army who, on foreign soil and during the present war, has been especially distinguished in the higher command of military forces of the United States; and the officer appointed under the foregoing authorization shall have the pay prescribed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, and such allowances as the President shall deem appropriate: *Provided*, That no more than one appointment to office shall be made under said authorization.

Mr. KING. I raise the point of order against the amendment that it is general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I presume a point of order will lie against the amendment; but I hope the Senator will not make a point of order against it. It only applies to one man in the Army, and that man is the general who commanded the American forces in France. There have only been four, or possibly five, men who have occupied that rank in the history of the United States. They were Washington, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan, and not one of those distinguished officers ever commanded as large an army as did Gen. Pershing—with what success the American people and our allies in this war understand. I think the amendment ought to be agreed to by the Senate and added to this bill by a unanimous vote. That is all I care to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. NEW. I offer an amendment to add a new section to chapter 2, on page 76. I will state that the amendment is intended to cover the case of the Chicago refrigerator plant, a question which was fully discussed here this afternoon, I believe. I understand that the amendment is acceptable to those who objected to the original amendment as it was found in the bill. I will ask the Secretary to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana.

The SECRETARY. On page 76, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized, through the Secretary of War, upon terms and conditions considered advisable by the Secretary of War, to dispose of the United States Army cold-storage plant in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, with machinery and equipment therein contained, and appurtenances thereunto belonging, and to accept in part payment therefor a warehouse adjacent to the Army general supply depot in the city of Chicago, State of Illinois, containing approximately 650,000 square feet of storage space, together with the land comprising the site of same: *Provided further*, That such exchange shall be effected without expenditure for this purpose by the United States, except necessary costs of conveyancing, not exceeding \$500, hereby appropriated for this purpose. The President, through the Secretary of War, is hereby authorized to execute and deliver, in the name of the United States of America and in its behalf, any and

all contracts, conveyances, or other instruments necessary to effect such sale or exchange.

Sec. 4. That all moneys received by the United States as the proceeds of any such sale or exchange shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of "Miscellaneous receipts," and a full report of the same shall be submitted to Congress.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I should like to say just a word about this proposed amendment. It will be observed that it limits the power of exchange to the one plant, which is a refrigerating plant, built by the Government about one year ago, at a cost, as I remember, of about \$3,300,000. The Government has the opportunity to make that exchange now for a much needed storage warehouse and to get a bonus of several hundred thousand dollars. The Government does not need the refrigerator plant any longer, but does very much need the other plant. Failing to make the exchange, it would have to purchase the additional storage facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I am not disposed to question the merit of the amendment, but I rise to inquire of the chairman of the committee how much longer he expects the Senate to remain in session.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had hoped that the individual amendments would not give rise to debate. They have been passed about, and everybody has agreed upon them, so far as I can understand. I hoped that they would be adopted without any question, but, if this amendment is going to give rise to debate, I shall move a recess.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not going to debate the amendment, but there are a number of other amendments to be offered, and I confess I am getting pretty tired. We have been in session since 12 o'clock.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the Senate stand in recess until to-morrow morning at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., Tuesday, June 24, 1919) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.

AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

William E. Gonzales, of South Carolina, to be ambassador extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Peru.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Boaz W. Long, of New Mexico, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Cuba.

Benton McMillin, of Tennessee, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Guatemala.

UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE.

Frank L. Polk, of New York, to be Undersecretary of State.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Frank K. Nebeker, of Utah, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Francis J. Kearful, resigned.

MEMBER OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Robert L. Faris, of Missouri, for appointment as a member of the Mississippi River Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved June 28, 1879, entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of a 'Mississippi River Commission' for the improvement of said river from the Head of the Passes near its mouth to its headwaters," vice Homer P. Ritter, deceased.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Arthur Joachims, of California, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Payson A. Perrin, of Massachusetts, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Paul V. Lane, of California, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Roland D. Horne, of Massachusetts, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

George H. Durgin, of New Hampshire, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

Charles K. Green, of California, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer (by promotion from aid) in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce.

APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

To be major general.

Brig. Gen. George W. Burt, United States Army, from March 5, 1919.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

George R. Rogers, late cadet, United States Military Academy (since retired from active service), to be second lieutenant with rank from March 19, 1919.

INFANTRY.

Cadet Julius Lynch Piland to be second lieutenant with rank from November 1, 1918.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants with rank from March 5, 1919.

First Lieut. Earl Hazelton Hare, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Robert Effinger Cumming, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Thomas Matthew Calladine, jr., Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. William Davis Gill, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Harvey David Thornburg, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Charles Smith Moss, Medical Reserve Corps.
First Lieut. Irwin Bradfield Smock, Medical Reserve Corps.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

Cadet Milo Benson Barragan to be second lieutenant with rank from June 12, 1918.

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

To be assistant surgeons general with rank of brigadier general.

Col. Walter D. McCaw, Medical Corps, from March 5, 1919.
Lieut. Col. Robert E. Noble, Medical Corps, from March 5, 1919.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Jerome P. Bowes, jr., Field Artillery, Officers' Reserve Corps, to be second lieutenant with rank from October 26, 1917.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Thomas Garlot Hannon, Officers' Reserve Corps, to be second lieutenant with rank from October 26, 1917.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENTS BY PROMOTION, IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Simon Medine, Corps of Engineers, from October 23, 1918.

First Lieut. Samuel L. Kuhn, Corps of Engineers, from October 26, 1918.

First Lieut. Roy M. McCutchen, Corps of Engineers, from December 29, 1918.

First Lieut. William Lohmeyer, jr., Corps of Engineers, from January 7, 1919.

First Lieut. William A. Clark, Corps of Engineers, from January 15, 1919.

First Lieut. Aubrey H. Bond, Corps of Engineers, from February 7, 1919.

First Lieut. Hubert W. Collins, Corps of Engineers, from March 16, 1919.

First Lieut. Maurice P. Van Buren, Corps of Engineers, from April 6, 1919.

First Lieut. Frederick S. H. Smith, Corps of Engineers, from April 13, 1919.

First Lieut. Frank B. Hastie, Corps of Engineers, from April 16, 1919.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Paul W. Rutledge, Coast Artillery Corps, from November 3, 1918.

Second Lieut. Alvin C. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 8, 1918.

Second Lieut. James C. Corliss, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 8, 1918.

Second Lieut. Robert T. Chaplin, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 11, 1918.

Second Lieut. Chester B. McCoid, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 15, 1918.

Second Lieut. Robert G. Rhett, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from December 21, 1918.

Second Lieut. James K. Morris, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 23, 1918.

Second Lieut. Charles E. Bates, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 26, 1918.

Second Lieut. Marshall L. Gosserand, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1918.

Second Lieut. Winthrop M. Allen, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1918.

Second Lieut. St. John Waddell, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from January 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. Cary B. Easley, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Nicholas B. O'Connell, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Oscar D. McNeely, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Abraham R. Ginsburg, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Vincent K. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles L. Ordeman, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 10, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ramon Conroy, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 10, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas J. Betts, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Morris C. Handwerk, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles Cobb, 3d Coast Artillery Corps, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Benjamin F. Harmon, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph A. Densmore, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles C. Bell, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from January 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Lawrance, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 16, 1919.

Second Lieut. David W. Burgeon, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Raymond B. Bottom, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Farrant L. Turner, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Henry T. Morrison, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 29, 1919.

Second Lieut. Leonard R. Crews, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 2, 1919.

Second Lieut. Harold M. Jobes, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 6, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas J. Delaney, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 8, 1919.

Second Lieut. William F. Cassidy, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from February 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. John W. Loveland, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Webster H. Warren, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Evan H. Benoy, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 16, 1919.

Second Lieut. John B. Bethen, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from February 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles W. Higgins, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Hugh N. Herrick, Coast Artillery Corps, from February 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Harry L. Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 1, 1919.

Second Lieut. Robert Mochrie, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Albert B. Ede, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. Donald W. Tyrrell, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. Everett M. Barton, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 6, 1919.

Second Lieut. Waren S. Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 7, 1919.

Second Lieut. William W. Wertz, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 7, 1919.

Second Lieut. Evans R. Crowell, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 13, 1919.

Second Lieut. Simon L. Bear, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 20, 1919.

Second Lieut. James C. Bates, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. William A. West, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, from March 29, 1919.

Second Lieut. Louis H. Thompson, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 2, 1919.

Second Lieut. Albert Bonds, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 2, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas W. Conrad, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 6, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frederick W. Hoorn, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 6, 1919.

Second Lieut. Joseph C. Stephens, Coast Artillery Corps, from April 19, 1919.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. John Van H. Challiss, Field Artillery, from November 10, 1918.

Second Lieut. Junius S. Roberts, Field Artillery, from December 6, 1918.

Second Lieut. Frederic W. W. Graham, jr., Field Artillery, from December 6, 1918.

Second Lieut. Joseph R. Estabrook, Field Artillery, from December 7, 1918.

Second Lieut. Harold D. Finley, Field Artillery, from December 10, 1918.

Second Lieut. Leo J. Vogel, Field Artillery, from December 17, 1918.

Second Lieut. James P. Kelly, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Richard B. von Maur, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Harold T. Deeds, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Millard L. Hamaker, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. John B. Fidler, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Wilbur B. Sumner, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. William E. Corkill, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Charles D. Brown, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Lester M. Kilgarif, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Krotzer, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Robert L. Randol, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Douglas I. Crane, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Harry N. Blue, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Frederic H. Timmerman, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. James H. McHenry, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Gurney L. Smith, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. John M. Franklin, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. George S. Goodspeed, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Amos E. Carmichael, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Raymond H. Seagle, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. John V. Anderson, Field Artillery, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Walter Rompel, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Winfred C. Green, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Marion I. Voorhes, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Algernon S. Coleman, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Robert F. La Barron, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edgar G. Crossman, Field Artillery, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. James H. Boyd, Field Artillery, from January 24, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph K. Learnard, Field Artillery, from January 25, 1919.

Second Lieut. Pitt F. Carl, jr., Field Artillery, from January 28, 1919.

Second Lieut. David W. Potter, Field Artillery, from February 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. John H. Gardner, jr., Field Artillery, from February 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. Earl C. Ewert, Field Artillery, from February 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. Donald D. Demarest, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph W. Hahn, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Orrin P. Kilbourn, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. John T. Clancy, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Winthrop W. Leach, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. John W. O'Harrow, jr., Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. James B. Dick, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Dan C. Kenan, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Joseph A. Martz, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Andrew S. Messick, Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Lee B. Goff, jr., Field Artillery, from February 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Kenneth S. Wallace, Field Artillery, from February 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph Heatherington, Field Artillery, from February 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Eugene B. Ripley, jr., Field Artillery, from February 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thornton Davis, Field Artillery, from February 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frederick M. Williams, Field Artillery, from February 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. William E. Farthing, Field Artillery, from February 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. John C. Butner, jr., Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. William B. Bowles, jr., Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edward Cummings, Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Eugene Weston, jr., Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edward S. Ott, Field Artillery, from February 27, 1919.

Second Lieut. Richard D. Roquemore, Field Artillery, from March 8, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph B. Bagby, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Melvin L. McCreary, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. John S. Brown, jr., Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Eugene M. Re Qua, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Herman H. F. Gossett, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Murray M. Montgomery, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Roderick J. McIntosh, Field Artillery, from March 21, 1919.

Second Lieut. Lester J. Whitlock, Field Artillery, from March 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Hinton F. Longino, Field Artillery, from March 30, 1919.

Second Lieut. Frederick H. Black, Field Artillery, from April 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. William B. Cobb, Field Artillery, from April 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. Angelus T. Burch, Field Artillery, from April 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. Chisholm Garland, Field Artillery, from April 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Harvey Edward, Field Artillery, from April 13, 1919.

Second Lieut. George P. Hays, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. George W. Cassell, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ralph J. Canine, Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. William L. Baily, jr., Field Artillery, from April 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. Donald A. Carson, Field Artillery, from April 19, 1919.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Wingate Battle, Cavalry, from November 15, 1918.

Second Lieut. Harold B. Wharfield, Cavalry, from November 15, 1918.

Second Lieut. Wade C. Gatchell, Cavalry, from November 15, 1918.

Second Lieut. Norman D. Twichell, Cavalry, from November 23, 1918.

Second Lieut. Andrew J. Wynne, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.

Second Lieut. Howard C. Wiener, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.

Second Lieut. Walter F. Goodman, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.

Second Lieut. Thomas M. Benson, Cavalry, from November 25, 1918.

Second Lieut. Lucian K. Truscott, jr., Cavalry, from December 10, 1918.

Second Lieut. Ralph E. Alstead, Cavalry, from December 13, 1918.

Second Lieut. James H. Akerman, Cavalry, from December 19, 1918.

Second Lieut. Raymond T. Connell, Cavalry, from December 21, 1918.

Second Lieut. James N. W. McClure, Cavalry, from December 25, 1918.

Second Lieut. Gabriel R. Mead, Cavalry, from December 28, 1918.

Second Lieut. David McK. Wilson, Cavalry, from January 9, 1919.

Second Lieut. Leonard M. Mertz, Cavalry, from January 10, 1919.

Second Lieut. Ernest A. Williams, Cavalry, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Slocum Kingsbury, Cavalry, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. George H. Millholland, Cavalry, from January 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Gardiner S. Platt, Cavalry, from January 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Donald R. Dunkle, Cavalry, from January 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Chester E. Davis, Cavalry, from January 20, 1919.

Second Lieut. Holmes G. Paullin, Cavalry, from January 23, 1919.

Second Lieut. John H. Irving, Cavalry, from January 24, 1919.

Second Lieut. Evan D. Cameron, jr., Cavalry, from January 25, 1919.

Second Lieut. William F. McLaughlin, Cavalry, from February 4, 1919.

Second Lieut. Glenn S. Finley, Cavalry, from February 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Manly F. Meador, Cavalry, from February 17, 1919.

Second Lieut. Stephen W. Davis, Cavalry, from February 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Clarence B. Werts, Cavalry, from February 18, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Unger, Cavalry, from February 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. William D. Tabor, Cavalry, from February 19, 1919.

Second Lieut. Edward M. Fickett, Cavalry, from February 20, 1919.

Second Lieut. James C. Van Ingen, Cavalry, from March 3, 1919.

Second Lieut. Callie H. Palmer, Cavalry, from March 11, 1919.

Second Lieut. Charles R. Chase, Cavalry, from March 12, 1919.

Second Lieut. Thomas F. Mishou, jr., Cavalry, from March 14, 1919.

Second Lieut. Robert B. Jackson, Cavalry, from March 15, 1919.

Second Lieut. Christopher C. Strawn, Cavalry, from March 25, 1919.

Second Lieut. John R. Breitinger, Cavalry, from March 26, 1919.

Second Lieut. Alfred J. de Lorimer, Cavalry, from March 28, 1919.

Second Lieut. William O. Coleman, Cavalry, from April 5, 1919.

Second Lieut. Herbert R. Sargeant, Cavalry, from April 6, 1919.

Second Lieut. John E. Ketchum, Cavalry, from April 15, 1919.

INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Harold M. McClelland, Infantry, to be first lieutenant with rank from August 8, 1917.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Seely B. Fahey, from October 8, 1918.

First Lieut. Philip S. Wood, from October 8, 1918.

To be first lieutenants.

Second Lieut. Eugene M. Frederick, from October 5, 1918.

Second Lieut. Cassius H. Styles, from October 8, 1918.

Second Lieut. Frederick J. Slackford, from October 9, 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Lieut. Col. Henry M. Morrow, Judge Advocate, to be colonel from December 9, 1918.

Maj. James J. Mayes, Judge Advocate, to be lieutenant colonel from December 9, 1918.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

To be colonels with rank from January 27, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Clarence C. Williams (Chief of Ordnance).

Lieut. Col. Samuel Hof, Ordnance Department.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Maj. Lewis H. Rand, Corps of Engineers, to be lieutenant colonel from February 7, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Clarence L. Sturdevant, Corps of Engineers, from February 7, 1919.

Capt. Earl J. Atkisson, Corps of Engineers, from April 16, 1919.

Capt. Richard T. Coiner, Corps of Engineers, from May 1, 1919.

First Lieut. Llewellyn B. Griffith, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 21, 1918.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. William Chamberlaine, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 9, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Gordon G. Heiner, Coast Artillery Corps, from March 21, 1919.

FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Thomas E. Merrill, Field Artillery, to be colonel, from January 31, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Edward T. Donnelly, Field Artillery, from January 5, 1919.

Maj. George M. Brooke, Field Artillery, from January 31, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Charles J. Ferris, Field Artillery, from January 5, 1919.

Capt. William Bryden, Field Artillery, from January 31, 1919.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Theodore W. Wrenn, Field Artillery, from November 10, 1918.

First Lieut. Harold W. Rehm, Field Artillery, from January 26, 1919.

CAVALRY ARM.

To be majors, with rank from November 2, 1918.

Capt. Walter S. Grant, Cavalry (General Staff Corps).

Capt. Charles M. Wesson, Cavalry (Ordnance Department).

Capt. Morton C. Mumma, Cavalry.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Ion C. Holm, Cavalry, with rank from December 19, 1918.

First Lieut. Robert C. Candee, Cavalry, with rank from January 11, 1919.

First Lieut. Joseph L. Philips, Cavalry, with rank from January 18, 1919.

First Lieut. Kenneth McCatty, Cavalry, with rank from January 24, 1919.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Geer, Cavalry, with rank from February 4, 1919.

INFANTRY.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Paul A. Wolf, from December 31, 1918.

Lieut. Col. George D. Moore (Inspector General's Department), from January 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Willis Uline, from January 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Charles C. Clark, from January 4, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Vernon A. Caldwell, from January 8, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Edmund L. Butts (subject to examination required by law), from January 9, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Henry J. Hunt (subject to examination required by law), from February 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Truman O. Murphy (The Adjutant General's Department), from February 2, 1919.

Lieut. Col. Ross L. Bush, from February 2, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Hugh D. Wise, from October 8, 1918.

Maj. Pegram Whitworth, from October 8, 1918.

Maj. James A. Moss, from November 2, 1918.

Maj. Ulysses G. Worrilow (since retired from active service), from January 2, 1919.

Maj. Frank J. Morrow (General Staff), from January 4, 1919.

Maj. Henry C. Clement, jr. (subject to examination required by law), from January 4, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. Alvin C. Voris, from October 8, 1918.

Capt. Fred L. Davidson, from October 8, 1918.

Capt. George E. Kumpe, from November 2, 1918.

Capt. Milo C. Corey, from December 19, 1918.

Capt. Arthur M. Ferguson, from December 19, 1918.

Capt. De Witt W. Chamberlin (Quartermaster Corps), from January 4, 1919.

Capt. Walter H. Johnson (General Staff), from January 4, 1919.

Capt. Robert G. Rutherford, jr., from January 4, 1919.

First Lieut. Harvey C. Kearney, to be captain, from October 9, 1918.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be colonels.

Lieut. Col. Louis T. Hess, Medical Corps, from August 30, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Christopher C. Collins, Medical Corps, from October 30, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Benjamin J. Edger, jr., Medical Corps, from November 11, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Samuel M. Waterhouse, Medical Corps, from December 3, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Eugene H. Hartnett, Medical Corps, from March 8, 1919.

To be lieutenant colonels.

Maj. Leartus J. Owen, Medical Corps, from December 3, 1918.

Maj. Robert M. Culler, Medical Corps, from March 1, 1919.

Maj. Frank W. Weed, Medical Corps, from March 8, 1919.

Maj. William A. Wickline, Medical Corps, from March 12, 1919.

To be majors.

Capt. William M. Archer, jr., Medical Corps, from September 18, 1918.

Capt. Henry F. Phillips, Medical Corps, from September 18, 1918.

Capt. Nicholson F. Curtis, Medical Corps, October 9, 1918.

Capt. John S. C. Fielden, jr., Medical Corps, from November 8, 1918.

Capt. John M. Hewitt, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Claude W. Cummings, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. James M. Troutt, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Alan DeF. Smith, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Frank M. Ende, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Samuel A. White, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Albert W. Greenwell, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

Capt. Francis M. Fitts, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Eric A. Fennel, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Paul E. McNabb, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Harvey E. Webb, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. George F. Aycock, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Henry W. Grady, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Philip J. Lukens, jr., Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Norman McL. Scott, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Marion R. Mobley, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.
 Capt. Frederick K. Herpel, Medical Corps, from November 24, 1918.

To be captains with rank from November 24, 1918.

First Lieut. Horace S. Villars, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Allen D. Lazenby, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Patrick F. McGuire, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James W. McClaran, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Louis F. Boyd, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Tom S. Mebane, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edmund B. Spaeth, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Philip L. Coulter, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. James B. Montgomery, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Percy E. Duggins, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Brown S. McClintic, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry K. B. Hufford, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph G. Fernbach, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Howard H. Dignan, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles W. Sale, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert H. Lowry, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Hertel P. Makel, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Ward S. Wells, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Seymour C. Schwartz, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Burgh S. Burnet, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Karl F. Kesmodel, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Ross Golden, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Curtis D. Pillsbury, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Nelson A. Myll, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John R. De Velling, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Roy L. Scott, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. William W. Southard, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. George H. Dorsey, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Laurent L. La Roche, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Dooling, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frank S. Matlack, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Cleon J. Gentzkow, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James P. Crawford, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert A. Hale, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Allen R. Howard, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Benjamin B. Rowley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Bradford, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry H. Towler, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Oral B. Bollbaugh, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph R. Jones, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harold E. Clark, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Roland A. Davison, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Haskett L. Conner, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward B. Macon, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Percy J. Carroll, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Virginius Minervini, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James V. Falisi, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William D. Petit, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Glenn H. Reams, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Jay DeP. Mings, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Allan W. Dawson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John W. McKeever, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Ottis L. Graham, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Edwin H. Roberts, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Arthur M. Bacon, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John J. Moore, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Anthony J. Vadala, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Maurice S. Weaver, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John M. Stanley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Arthur H. Nylen, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Myron P. Rudolph, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Noble DuB. McCormack, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles E. Sima, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Bascom H. Palmer, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harold D. Rogers, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John R. Hall, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Arthur R. Gaines, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William L. Starnes, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William A. Boyle, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Manton L. Shelby, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Paul H. Streit, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John E. Robinson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Lewis E. J. Browne, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Ernest K. Stratton, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James A. Orbison, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Paul M. N. Kyle, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William C. Whitmore, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Albert B. Pavy, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Francis E. Evans, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Charles E. Brenn, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Francis T. Duffy, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Leonard W. Weaver, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Louie Felger, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Leo S. Trask, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Raymond A. Tomassene, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Lowyd W. Ballantyne, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Otto R. Brown, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles E. Yoho, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Cornelius A. Denehy, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph P. Madigan, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert K. Simpson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Patrick S. Madigan, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frederick B. Little, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Chester A. Stayton, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Herbert W. Rogers, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John R. Evers, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Ralph E. Curti, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Daniel C. Hankey, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frederick A. Blesse, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles C. Dickey, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. George B. Fletcher, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Walter H. Mytinger, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John J. Carden, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry E. Fraser, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John R. Whisenant, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harold H. Golding, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harry P. Shugerman, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William C. Pollock, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William W. McCaw, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward H. Tonolla, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Earle D. Quinell, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Harold O. Brown, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Douglas H. Mebane, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Paul B. Johnson, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Irving K. Lovett, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Montreville A. St. Peter, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frank McA. Moose, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Percy K. Telford, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Benjamin F. Pence, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Wayne R. Beardsley, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Warren Stirling, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Don G. Hildrup, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Richard S. Magee, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William A. Smith, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frank W. Pinger, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Ivy A. Pelzman, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward S. Murphy, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Richard E. Werlich, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Herbert R. Stolz, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Louis de K. Belden, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Andrew W. Smith, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Willard S. Howard, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Philip P. Green, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William H. Barrow, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Gordon F. Willey, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Frank A. Plum, Medical Corps.

First Lieut. Charles R. Irving, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).

First Lieut. William W. Jones, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles C. Hawke, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Noland M. Canter, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Pierre N. Charbonnet, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James C. Kimbrough, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Meredith R. Johnston, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Merrill K. Lindsay, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. William D. Middleton, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Leon H. Cornwall, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Read B. Harding, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. James W. Duckworth, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Bradford Massey, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edgar H. Howell, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. George W. Snyder, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Paul S. Wagner, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. John A. P. Millet, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph D. Foley, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Lewis A. Newfield, Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Thomas M. Leahy, Medical Corps (subject to examination required by law).
 First Lieut. Louis A. LaGarde, jr., Medical Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward L. Moore, Medical Corps.

DENTAL CORPS.

To be captains with rank from July 13, 1918.

First Lieut. Samuel J. Rohde, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Leroy P. Hartley, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Frederick C. Daniels, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Nathan C. Pickles, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert L. Lowry, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Oliver J. Christiansen, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Timothy Harden, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Lawrence K. Anderson, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Timothy F. Leary, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. William C. Webb, jr., Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward C. Alley, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Clinton R. Boone, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. David I. Edwards, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Orville A. Grove, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Roy M. Kisner, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Edward A. Thorne, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Lynn H. Tingay, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Claude R. Hollister, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Marhl H. Welch, Dental Corps.

To be captains with rank from October 4, 1918.

First Lieut. Walter D. Vail, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Richard K. Thompson, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Leslie S. Harlan, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Neil J. McCollum, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Clement J. Gaynor, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Walter A. Rose, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Melvin R. Eiche, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. George Krakow, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Eugene A. Smith, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Jerome L. Fritsche, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Clarence J. Wright, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Milton A. Price, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. William H. Hohlitzell, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Francis M. Tench, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Alvin E. Anthony, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. William J. R. Akeroyd, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Fletcher D. Rhodes, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. William D. Caldwell, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Lewis W. Maly, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Arthur T. Burchill, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Glover Johns, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Frederick W. Herms, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Harold J. Parker, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Leslie D. Baskin, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Curtis W. Hallam, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. James E. Dean, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry L. Hogan, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. John C. Campbell, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Leland S. Wilson, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Benjamin H. Dean, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Dell S. Gray, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Julius L. Bischof, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles H. Brunnell, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. John A. Rowe, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. William T. Williams, Dental Corps.

First Lieut. Hooker O. Lindsey, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Alvin D. Dannheiser, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. James R. Conner, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Robert L. Strickland, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Roy R. Newman, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Boyd L. Smith, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Avery G. Holmes, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. George R. Kennebeck, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Alexander M. Smith, jr., Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Horace R. Finley, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Cecil R. Hays, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Roy C. Starr, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Harold S. Embree, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Charles L. Andrews, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Byram S. Purviance, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph L. Boyd, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Joseph L. Rahm, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Clarence R. Jacobson, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Norman M. Mackenzie, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Richard F. Thompson, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Henry H. Collins, Dental Corps.
 First Lieut. Adrian C. Ragan, Dental Corps.

PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY. FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Eugene G. Miller, Coast Artillery Corps, to be second lieutenant in the Field Artillery, with rank from November 1, 1918.

COAST ARTILLERY ARM.

Second Lieut. Richard A. Ericson, Field Artillery, to be second lieutenant in the Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from November 1, 1918.

TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

INFANTRY.

First Lieut. Kelton L. Pepper, United States Army, retired, to be captain with rank from July 1, 1916.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of June 23), 1919.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE OF MINT.

William A. Burns to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE.

Thomas G. Haight to be United States circuit judge, third circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

James Clifton Wilson to be United States district judge, northern district of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, June 24, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit our Heavenly Father, we bless Thee for the high and glorious aspirations which leap like angels from the temples of our hearts, beckoning us ever onward to the higher ideals of manhood. Increase our faith and confidence in Thee and in our own ability, assured that if we work and faint not, we shall reap the rewards of a faithful life, through the promises of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A DELEGATE.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Delegate from Hawaii, Mr. KALANIANA'OLE, is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. KALANIANA'OLE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—WATER-POWER LEGISLATION.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one minute, to lay the foundation for a request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to address the House for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.